



Washington State Ferries Draft Long-Range Strategic Plan

Public & Agency Comments

I. Overall Comments



Comment Date: 7/31/2006

Contact Type: Letter

Name: Charlie Howard

Organization: PSRC

Comment:

The Puget Sound Regional Council is pleased to offer these comments on the Long-Range Strategic Plan for Washington State Ferries. Overall, the document is excellent. The plan is easy to read, well organized and presents information in an understandable way. From a technical standpoint, we applaud the plan as being well done.

We've prepared our comments in two groups: (1) comments specific to the draft report; and (2) comments for consideration in future planning efforts.

Comments specific to the draft plan

1. Overall the Plan is a reasonable approach to determine the size of the ferry fleet and number of docks needed at each terminal. However, the focus of the analysis should be broadened to include a full discussion of the positive implications on ridership that land use changes on and around the terminals would have. WE suggest this discussion be added in such areas of the plan as: p.8-Local Plans, p.11-How Much Growth is Expected, p.22 and p.48-Terminal Implications, and p.50 and p.66 in the discussion of Colman Dock. Fro example, the plan might evaluate the redevelopment activity in downtown Bremerton and its impacts on: (1) non-single occupancy vehicle access to the ferry dock, and (2) generating new demand for ferry service, during peak commuter hours and off-peak hours.

2. The WSF Long-Range Strategic Plan states (see Plan Development and Options Analysis, page 10) the ferry model uses the 1999 origin and destination survey results as the base for travel and mode choice. These O&D data are now seven years old. During this time, the ferry system has undergone significant change; the 1999 survey results may not reflect current or future travel behavior. We understand WSF is planning to update the O&D survey this fall (2006). While it appears this schedule will not allow the results of the new survey to be used in the current Long-Range Strategic Plan (LRSP), we suggest you incorporate the survey results into future planning for the ferry system.

3. There's no discussion of season summer tourist season peaks in the LRSP. The plan should discuss whether and how this aspect of demand was incorporated into the modeling effort and in determining service and facility needs.

4. The plan shows a need to achieve fare recovery rates of greater than 80%. The implications of lower recovery rates are significant, and according to the plan would likely increase demand and generate reduced revenues. Because of the huge importance of fare recovery rates, the adopted plan should clearly state what the fare recovery rates will be, as determined the Transportation Commission (not just the rates assumed in the plan).

5. Non-vehicle modes other than fully functioning pedestrians (such as ADA or special needs users) should be addressed in the plan. This should include a discussion of how special needs passengers are dealt with when transferring from Kitsap Transit's Access service to King Co.



metro's Access service (paratransit service for the mobility impaired), and should include a discussion of the status of ADA compliance in general.

Comments for Consideration in Future Planning Efforts

The following comments are directed at broader, long-range growth management and transportation planning issues, which might be appropriately addressed during the updates to VISION 2020 and Destination 2030, both of which will occur between now and 2008-2010.

6. The plan assumes Washington State Ferries will discontinue all passenger-only ferry service in the future (the mandate from the 2006 Legislature is July 1, 2007), and this service will be transferred to another operator(s), public or private. PSRC is currently planning to commence a Regional Passenger-Only Ferry Study to evaluate future options and develop a regional approach to transitioning POF service from the state to other operators. We look forward to working with you and our other ferry system planning partners on this study.

7. While your planning effort has done an excellent job of identifying future demand and ferry service investment and service needs, we believe there is a strong need for ongoing integrated planning to connect the ferry system with other transportation, growth, and economic development planning efforts in the central Puget Sound region. Increasingly, the ferry system is becoming a more robust component of our regional multi-modal transportation system, with increasing needs for seamless connections between the ferry system and transit, non-motorized facilities, and state and local highways. In addition, growth in ferry system traffic (both vehicles and passengers) places increasing strain on the state highways serving the ferry terminals. In many cases these highways are the "Main Street" of host communities. For these host communities, ferry system traffic poses both a problem (congestion, noise, ect.) and an opportunity (economic development potential, access to jobs and other services in the region, ferry-supportive land use, ect.). As the Regional Council continues our efforts to update VISION 2020 and Destination 2030 over the next two to three years, we would hope to engage WSF and affected jurisdictions throughout the region in cooperative planning to address these common issues. Some of the issues we believe deserve attention in this regard include:

- The need to identify and evaluate transit needs and transit-ferry coordination throughout the region, including additional coordinated planning relative to the impacts and implications of the WSF plan's goal of creating improved multi-modal connections at the new Edmonds and Mukilteo terminals, and an enhanced Colman Dock, where ferry walk-on traffic will need to connect with regional transit (Sounder and other services).

- Planning for non-motorized facilities to serve ferry passengers, and tying these into the regional non-motorized network.

- The WSF plan raises the issue of ferry system and highway capacity constraints and the need to manage traffic growth on SR-305 on Bainbridge Island. To address this issue, the ferry system plan relies on a future passenger-only service in the Seattle-Kingston corridor to draw enough passenger demand away from the Seattle-Bainbridge route. While this approach may address the issue from a ferry system perspective, it may have broader implications relative to the need for improved transit connections, ferry supportive land use near ferry terminals, improvements on state highways serving ferry terminals, and local land use and other impacts in Kingston.



-The WSF Long-Range Strategic Plan (Exhibit 23, page 48) shows forecast increases in vehicle and foot-passenger traffic (during a 4-hour peak and a 1-hour peak) expected by 2030 at the terminals serving Kitsap Peninsula. Although the expected increases in vehicles using the ferries are modest, the increases in foot-passengers are significant, and have implication both for transit service and for traffic leaving Park-and-ride lots and passenger pick-up locations. The Long-Range Strategic Plan does not seem to adequately address vehicle volumes and their impacts on local and regional roadways serving the ferry terminals. Impacts of vehicle volumes beyond the immediate area of the ferry terminals should be addressed in the ferry system plan and coordinated with the highway system component of the WTP. PSRC is interested in working with WSF and WSDOT to develop improvements to our travel demand models to better understand the impacts of, and plan for, the pulse of traffic which results when large ferries empty their loads onto local streets and state highways in ferry communities.

-PSRC hopes to work with WSF and local jurisdictions to address the issue of the jobs-housing balance throughout the region, and especially between Kitsap County and Seattle/King County. There is a long-standing trend of Kitsap County residents commuting across the Sound to jobs in Seattle and King County. Our most recent forecasts for Kitsap County show population will continue to grow faster than employment, causing a growing pressure for workers to commute from their homes in Kitsap to jobs across the Sound. While improved ferry service and increased capacity correctly responds to the growing market, we still face a dilemma of how to create more jobs in Kitsap County to provide alternatives to cross-Sound commuting. PSRC's current and continuing work to update VISION 2020 and Destination 2030, and to implement our Regional Economic Strategy, present an excellent opportunity to collectively respond to this issue.

Thank you for providing us the opportunity to comment on your plan. We look forward to working with you to address the broader regional issues we raised herein.

Comment Date: 7/31/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Steve McGonigal
Organization: WA State Noxious Weed Control Board

Comment:

I am writing to provide input on the Washington State Ferries Draft Long-Range Strategic Plan for 2006 through 2030. I will also submit my comments today via email to wsfplanning@wsdot.wa.gov, so that they are received during the comment period.

The document outlines plans to expand, operate and maintain Washington State Ferries (WSF) terminals and other properties. However, I was unable to find any discussion in the Plan on how WSF will control noxious weeds on properties it owns or controls. The final Plan should address how WSF noxious weed control responsibilities will be met.

Chapter 17.10 of the Revised Code of Washington and Chapter 16-750 of the Washington Administrative Code require all property owners, include state agencies, to control plants listed on the State Noxious Weed List. At this time, we have available a partial list of WSF terminals



that are infested with noxious weeds, and the weed species that are present. Please let us know if you would like this information.

We can also put WSF in touch with county noxious weed control personnel who can provide weed identification assistance at other terminals and properties. Some county weed boards report that their staffs have tried to contact WSF to report infestations, make control recommendations and offer assistance, only to leave repeated phone messages that are never returned. The final Plan should identify contacts for these county agencies to use.

Transportation systems are widely recognized as vectors for the spread of noxious weeds. Plants, seeds and other reproductive weed parts become lodged in tires, undercarriages, grills and other vehicle components, and travel with the vehicle to infest new areas. Puget Sound, with its wide expanses of marine water, could act as a natural barrier to the spread of many noxious weeds. That barrier effect will be neutralized, however, if infested vehicles travel across the Sound on Washington State Ferries. Vehicles traveling on ferries are more likely to be infested if the terminal properties themselves are infested with noxious weeds.

The likelihood that Washington State Ferries will spread noxious weeds among the eight counties served by the system will be further reduced if the final Plan identifies how WSF will educate passengers on how to inspect and free their vehicles of noxious weeds and weed seeds prior to departure. Please feel free to contact us if we can assist in developing educational messages and graphics for inclusion in your many printed materials and/or signage for ferry waiting areas.

Washington State Ferries are an icon of this beautiful state. The final Washington State Ferries Long-Range Strategic Plan should address how the ferry system will help protect the state's environment, citizens and economy from the many threats of noxious weeds.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Comment Date: 7/1/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Don & B.J. Craddock

Organization:

Comment:

This idea has been around before, but who knows, we may be ready for it now?

Make all of the ferries coming into the existing dock, people only. And all of the heavy duty traffic and cars could use the dock that should be built at the gravel pit.



Comment Date: 6/30/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Robert Warner

Organization:

Comment:

The following are my comments related to long range planning by the Washington State Ferry System. Now that I am retired, I ride the ferries for recreational events when I am staying in the Seattle area. Usually I try to avoid the "extra busy" times in early mornings, late afternoons, and week ends, especially during the summer months.

1. I believe that more emphasis is needed for using 3rd vessels or extra boats on busy runs during summer months. Even today, lines of traffic waiting for a ferry on busy week-ends are way, way too long. It is not uncommon to be stuck in these lines for two hours or more. There are no rest room facilities available during these long waits. The long range plan's schedule for adding additional vessels is weak in addressing this issue. In some cases, "extra" week end service is needed now and not 10 years in the future.

For example, on Sunday afternoon 25 June the WSF internet site said there was "a three boat wait" at Kingston. When something like this happens, why does MV Evergreen State remain tied up at Eagle Harbor?

I remember growing up in Seattle during the 1960's and back then 3rd vessels were frequently used on busy routes during the summer to address this problem. This summer you could be using MV Evergreen State in this type of service rather than keeping her in layup at Eagle Harbor. I also believe you could maintain the old "steel electric" vessels for this service after they are replaced on regular runs.

2. Using smaller vessels on the Port Townsend-Keystone run should be continued to avoid major reconstruction of the harbor at Keystone. Also, using just one vessel on this run during the summer is a bad idea. It creates too long of a wait time. I would also recommend that the in service time of the second vessel on the route be increased to 12 hours per day rather than the current 8 for at least 4 days each week.

3. Before changing the Southworth run to the downtown Seattle terminal, consider adding a 4th vessel to the current route during the summer. This is a complicated issue that needs additional study. I currently use this run rather than the Bremerton or Winslow runs to avoid driving in downtown Seattle.

In conclusion, I believe you need to revise the plan to add 3rd vessels and/or extra summer service now rather than ten or 15 years from now. The steel electrics and MV Evergreen State should be maintained for this purpose at least in the short term.



Comment Date: 4/5/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Gordon Badinger
Organization:

Comment:

Only thing I can say is that it's costing me too much to commute to my job.

Can't there be a tax incentive to ride public transit.

Comment Date: 4/4/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Judy Davidson
Organization:

Comment:

We moved to the Northwest 6 years ago. We have seen a steady decline in the cleanliness and upkeep on the ferries since we moved here. We wondered if you are aware how important they are to tourism and welcoming visitors to our state? While we were once so proud to take guests upstairs to show off the Washington State ferries, we now prefer to keep them in the car so as not to have them have to look out filthy windows, walk up stairs covered with gum and dirt and sit on benches that have not been cleaned or use restrooms that have not been attended to. Hopefully, maintenance can be budgeted back into the every day ferry operations even if it means spending a little of the money earmarked for promoting tourism.

Comment Date: 4/4/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Karen Hickman
Organization:

Comment:

I would like an effort made for the ferry system to work with Metro bus system and Sound Transit in meeting the boats. It is ridiculous that a Metro bus keeps missing the ferry by a few minutes day in and day out with lots of passengers. Work together and find a solution instead of saying you can't do it. The Metro Bus 54 needs vast improvements to meet the ferry. Get it done.

Ferry rider for years. No improvements yet.....



Comment Date: 4/4/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Ralph Taylor

Organization:

Comment:

I don't care what you do, just please, please, please make changes so that the vessels depart and arrive... on time. On time, that is all that I ask. Thanks for listening.

Comment Date: 4/4/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Bianca Vanderwal

Organization:

Comment:

To whoever REALLY cares:

You MUST be kidding me! Is this just political gobbledygook? The whole "Long Range" plan makes perhaps sense to some "genius" who got dropped on his head, but to the rest of us it is still Hieroglyphics!

The last time I got "involved" in this whole Ferry discussion group was in reference to the ticket book replacement!

Boy, am I smarter now!

As you may recall (or rather since this is political, you probably won't

recall!) this was a big issue for a lot of us Ferry Riders! Last time we went to the Island we were informed that the "card" will be replacing the booklet! The next time I plunk down well over \$150.00 it will be for "the card."

So, all the meetings really were a waste of time because you had already decided that you would pull the plug on the booklet!

If someone would just have sent me an e-mail telling me I was screwed, I could have handled that! But this patronizing comment that "you would like to hear from us and to give you our input" just makes me want to barf! So, whaaaat, you all sit around and laugh your heads off at the idiot who actually BELIEVED that you cared? Do you compare e-mails at the end of the day? The most gullable one gets the proverbial "price"?

In my opinion, the Ferry system has the same system as all the public schools do! Let's take as



much of the taxpayers money as we can get and piss it away! When it is gone "we'll threaten the public with more closures or cancel ferry schedules and they'll cough up more"! Here is an idea, let's put it all in one office and that way you'll have a little extra taxpayer money left over for some more 'brainless' ideas!

I learned my lesson and from now on I will save my energy for more useful things, like writing to my legislator who at least lets me know where and how a bill is going! Not that they really care either! It just baffles my mind with the stuff "The Government" gets away with! But what really blows my mind how many idiots out here fall for this crap and keep following blindly without speaking up! THAT is why the Government gets away with stuff like you guys pull!

Last time I corresponded with a Lady names Susan who was as nice as all get go, but had already blown me off before I finished my sentence!

I think you people on the public trough are just biding your time and screw the rest of us, who pay your way!

Thank you for letting me vent and hope you all get a good laugh!

Comment Date: 4/5/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Garry

Organization:

Comment:

WSF, like ALL transportation agencies, needs to start making the tough decision to concentrate on moving people instead of vehicles.

To that end we need to get passenger-only going again and smaller auto-ferries running more frequently.

Comment Date: 4/4/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Monica Downen

Organization:

Comment:

Hello, my name is Monica Downen and I have a quick question that I am hoping you can answer or that you will refer me to whomever can answer me.



I believe I heard that we will eventually get a system where we can use pre-paid cards to pay for ferry rides. Will the card values expire, like the current prepaid 'value' packs do? And if so, can you share with me what the logic is behind having something that we have paid for expire? Also, when might the card system go into affect?

Comment Date: 4/5/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Juliet Albertson

Organization:

Comment:

Apparently the person scheduling these meetings is not a regular commuter on the ferry system. In order to have full participation in these meetings, they need to be set after 7:00 or is the goal in setting them early to ensure low public input? We can be so annoying, what with our demanding service and all.

Comment Date: 4/5/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Shannon McDougall

Organization:

Comment:

O.K. I know it will never happen, but sure would be nice to have a commuter Ferry from Olympia to Tacoma, Gig Harbor and Seattle or even to Shelton.

We really don't have many options other than driving or busing it.

Comment Date: 5/2/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Meredith Green

Organization:

Comment:

Have you considered having a lunch time meeting in Seattle? It seems like that might be easier for commuters to attend. Even better yet, do a couple of sessions on the ferries.



Comment Date: 4/24/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Gordon Badinger
Organization:

Comment:

MO MONEY, MO MONEY.
This is out of hand! Everything is going up except my paycheck.

Comment Date: 4/4/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Anonymous
Organization:

Comment:

I quote your "long range plan":

"many citizens will need to use the ferry to commute to work on the east side of the Sound, leading to a nearly 70 percent increase in overall ferry ridership by the year 2030. Vehicle traffic is expected to grow at a slower rate, nearly 40 percent."

And yet, WSF decreases passenger ferries. Once again –displaying the ineptitude of WSF. I have been riding for 10 years from Bremerton – you're completely out of touch with what the people want. We want affordable and fast passenger only ferry service. We don't take our cars in and we don't want to be stuck on your slow slow slow boats.

I hate WSF.

Comment Date: 4/25/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Anna Tamura
Organization:

Comment:

1. I know that you are taking comments on the ferry plans but darn if I can find the spot on your website to access the email address and make a comment. Since it is difficult to find, it makes me wonder if you really want comments. Please put it on the first page.

2. Customer Feedback Form. Should be renamed to something like Feedback on Ferry



Service since that is what the form seems to be for.

3. What I want to comment on about the ferry plan is as follows so please forward to appropriate person:

With the cost of gas going up and the probable high demand for oil throughout the world in the future, I think that the ferry service should promote conservation by coming up with a plan whereby customers do not have to wait in line with their engines running. It has struck me for many years as an inefficient way to be waiting to get on the ferry. IT is especially apparent on the Mulkiteo-Clinton run. Surely someone in the ferry service can come up with a better idea. An auxiliary parking lot from which cars could be dispatched when the ferry is loading. Having the cars stopped on the hill and the ticket seller going to the cars and selling tickets so once loading starts cars can go rapidly through. Something!

Also, I know that the ferry system feels that they should be self-supporting to some extent. I still think that residents of the islands affected by ferry service should get some kind of price break since that is their "road". People who have roads instead of ferries do not have to pay a toll and we all pay for their roads. Why can't some "road" be paid for?

Thank you for the chance to comment.

Comment Date: 4/6/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Scott Walker

Organization:

Comment:

After reading the highlights of the draft plan, I'm struck by how WSF is mostly planning investments to more cars. It is imperative that we all, including WSF, plan on how to move more people and not more cars. Demand for subsidized motor vehicle travel is a substantial part of driver mode choice and a substantial part of the sprawl that is devouring our beloved Puget Sound. Please get with the program of GMA!

Comment Date: 4/6/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Kristopher Leplante

Organization:

Comment:

Good morning!

Addition and overall increase in the number of vessels operating on any given route is exciting.



Curious though...as a Security professional with the added vessel operations and ridership will come new demands on Security/Safety needs; both in physical sense and personal. Does the WSF include in it's planning, such issues? Thanks and have a great day!

Comment Date: 4/5/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Sandra Dykstra

Organization:

Comment:

You want to hear from us so here goes, There should be a priority lane for island property owners with special passes (that would cost \$50.00 per year).

The ferry workers should take a course on "how to respect the public". If there is a ferry delay, 5 miles from that terminal should be a sign saying the length of the delay (some ferry terminals have them but not all).

More to come later.

Comment Date: 4/10/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Michael Griffen

Organization:

Comment:

Are there plans to use biodiesel for the ferries? If so, when and what grade?

II. South Sound Corridor



Comment Date: 7/12/2006

Contact Type: Letter

Name: Darlene Kordonowy

Organization: Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council

Comment:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment upon the Draft Washington State ferries Long Range Plan. We have reviewed the document and discussed our concerns quite thoroughly. Your staff's willingness to provide cogent data analysis and input to those discussions through our Transportations Technical Advisory and Policy Committees has been quite useful.

Attached are our detailed comments. In short form, here are our main concerns:

- The Plan should prioritize ferry investment to Bremerton-Seattle i.e. with current equipment, shoulder operations beyond the current staffing levels and, after the 4 replacement boats; Bremerton- Seattle should be the first route to receive a new vessel.
- The Plan should anticipate, and the WSDOT should provide, coordinated landside improvements to handle projected increased in ferry service in terminal communities.
- The Plan should require WSF to plan collaboratively with the communities on both ends of each route to mitigate the impacts of vehicle queuing.
- The Plan should address and, if appropriate, incorporate new technologies and operations procedures.
- The plan should prioritize providing business-friendly all-day and bi-directional access throughout its service region.
- The 80% cost recovery model for fares should be considered the absolute maximum, the WSF should conduct a Cost of Service Analysis that demonstrates the viability of current levels of service
- The plan should hold off on certain decisions for 1-2 years, with specific provision for review and adjustment in the short term. As part of the short-term review and adjustment in the short term. As part of the short-term review, the Plan should include an updated financial analysis and service contingency plan.

The Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council is charged with the responsibility of providing countywide input to State and regional agencies on transportation and land use planning matters. Thanks you for attention.

KITSAP REGIONAL COORDINATING COUNCIL

Comments on the Draft Washington State Ferries Long Range Plan

1.The Washington state Ferries Long Range Plan should support local land use planning and



in-place transportation infrastructure investments.

- In particular, local leaders have assembled 62 million to construct the Bremerton Transportation Center, egress tunnel, and the passenger ferry. These investments are the result of Kitsap's commitment to the resurgence of downtown Bremerton. The Plan should prioritize ferry investment to Bremerton-Seattle, with current equipment, shoulder operations beyond the current staffing levels and , after the 4 replacement boats; Bremerton-Seattle should be the first route to receive a new vessel.

- Also the Plan should recognize the WSF's commitment to upgrading the Bainbridge Island Ferry Terminal and Maintenance Facility with 200 million of WSF funding over 20 years and the City's progress on land use planning with WSF as a partner immediately adjacent to that terminal.

- More generally, the State Audit Committee should review the Plan's effectiveness in supporting adopted local land use plans, for example: the continued bi-section of downtown Kingston, and the City of Seattle's planning for its local waterfront.

2. The Plan should anticipate, and the WSDOT should provide, coordinated landside improvements to handle projected increases in ferry service in terminal communities. Solutions need to incorporate context sensitive design in partnership with local jurisdictions.

- Specific to Kingston: Road and pedestrian connections and parking/holding areas are needed to address traffic impacts near the terminal, supporting the community's early stage redevelopment into a livable, walkable downtown. WSF/WSDOT should conduct a Traffic Impact Analysis based on the proposed land uses and design criteria from the Community Visioning process.

WSDOT began a Corridor Study of SR 104 but it lapsed in 2002 without conclusion; this needs to be re-instigated , extending from the intersections of Miller Bay Road/ Hansville Road at SR 104 to the ferry terminal itself. Emphasis would be on the recommendations developed in the Kingston Circulation Project; "3-Lane Phased Proposal" dated April 14th, 2002.

The priority for redeployment of a third vessel (as a "remainder" of replacing the four aging vessels) onto the Kingston- Edmonds route should be based on the Level of Service issues that occur from the weekend-centered traffic (as measure by "Boat-Waits/Minutes" experienced on that route on Friday-Monday during the period of mid-Spring through early Fall) and depending on the availability of passenger only ferry service Kingston –downtown Seattle route.

WSF should focus on its core missions of providing ferry service, and not compete with the local community's economic development. Specifically, the Plan should address WSF's intent to continue in a long term lease arrangement with the Port of Kingston for the Kingston terminal property. The Plan should also address collaborating with Port and the Kingston community in Kingston's master plan for the development of the terminal area.

- Specific to Southworth: In the Puget Sound Regional Council's Destination 2030, three segments of SR 160 are slated for widening; from the SR 16/160 interchange to Long Lake. However, these segments are a distance from the terminal and its community impacts. WSDOT should update the SR 160 Route Development Plan, with emphasis on road and pedestrian connections and parking/holding areas needed to address traffic impacts near the terminal.



WSDOT/WSF should contribute to the development of the Harper Park & Ride facility, which is needed whichever type of vessel and service is implemented in Southworth.

•Specific to Bainbridge Island : The City's Island Wide Transportation Study identified the division of the Island by ferry traffic on SR 305 as a major issue for the community. WSF/WSDOT should continue to support the SR 305 Corridor Study Update, the urban planning program in the ferry terminal area, and ongoing ferry terminal and maintenance facility upgrade projects (including the designation and implementation of a viable resolution for a boat haul-out facility).

The Puget Sound Regional Council is considering a proposal to micro-model the ferry surges that significantly impact ferry terminal communities, including summer traffic surges. Kitsap County would support this analysis as a tool to define the true impacts of off-loading ferry traffic, and capital facilities to mitigate those impacts. This may be a starting point for Traffic Analysis in Kingston, as described above.

On-loading ferry traffic – queuing – is a different, system-wide problem – Seattle, Edmonds, Kingston, San Juan Islands, Bainbridge Island, et al. Although each route generates queues at different times (peak commuter period or recreational traffic), the effects of a periodic stationary parking lot in the midst of a community's vehicle thoroughfare are detrimental. The Plan should require WSF to plan collaboratively with communities on both ends of each route to mitigate the impacts of vehicle queuing.

3.The Plan should address and if appropriate incorporate new technologies and operations procedures, such as transportation demand management, different propulsion systems to increase manageability of/speed up docking/departures and loading/off-loading, and improve fuel economy, advance reservations systems on Central Sound routes, etc.

4.Improving the jobs/housing balance in Kitsap County is a challenge well-recognized throughout the Kitsap community. One necessary component to Kitsap's economic development is a truly regional transportation system with cross-sound movement that is equal to the north/south corridors. Access to the Seattle economic/medical/cultural hub is a critical element of business' decision to locate on the Kitsap Peninsula. Peak hour service is not sufficient. The Plan should prioritize providing business friendly all-day bi-directional access throughout its service region.

5.The fare increases contemplated in the Plan – currently projected at 2 ½ % per year through 2030 plus the possibility of additional fuel surcharge – are stifling to users and crippling to our economy but still appear inadequate to cover costs that are increasing at several times the rate of inflation on both the operating and capital sides of the WSF projected budget. Calculation pricing sensitivity in terms of ridership drop-off (i.e. analyzing when riders tops using the boats in large enough numbers to offset the revenue gain) does serve WSF's institutional need for self-preservation, but it does not serve the ferry-dependent communities' need for equitability priced travel. Instead of looking for the price point that is "what the traffic will bear," the 80% cost recovery model should be considered the absolute maximum, especially in light of the strong resistance to vehicle tolls on the 520 Bridge. The WSF should conduct a Cost of Service Analysis that demonstrates the viability of current levels of service and ties future price increases to maintenance first and then to service increases throughout the system.

6.With regards to other specific service scenarios, the Plan should hold off on certain decisions



for 1-2 years, with specific provision for review and adjustment in the short term. While long range planning involves uncertainty, the WSF Long Range Planning Program faces substantial unknown factors – financial and situational – beyond the typical uncertainties. Chief among these are WSF budget constraints and the success of locally-provided passenger only ferry service Kitsap – King County. Unlike typical planning uncertainties, these relatively changes will affect choices about appropriate service patterns:

- The Viaduct Planning Program and the City of Seattle's efforts to resolve Fauntleroy terminal capacity and waterfront design issues, as they affect integrating a 4th slip and/or expanded vehicle holding capacity into the design of Colman Dock. (Affects primarily Southworth)
- Whether or not there will be implementation of Kitsap passenger ferry service and its effect on vehicle and passenger demand for additional WSF vessel and passenger seating capacity. (Particularly affects Southworth & Kingston) Downtown Seattle docking facilities are also a concern. Especially in light of widespread regional interest in for ferry service, adequate provision should be made to accommodate additional passenger-only ferry service.
- Whether or not the State Legislature will provide a stable source of long-term funding for WSF operations when gas tax revenues are falling (at a rate of \$4million shortfall/month) and every jurisdiction's fiscal horizons are shrinking. (Affects all service)
- If/when fuel prices continue to rise, the effect on ridership – both vehicle and passenger loads. (Affects all service)
- The effect of the second Tacoma Narrow Bridge on South Kitsap traffic flows after both Bridges are in full operation. (Affects primarily Southworth)

7. Considering the complexity of these choices and issues, it is of particular concern that the Plan as presented is not financially constrained to realistic assumptions about future operating and funding conditions. For example:

- The Plan for the next ten year projects \$1.63 billion for capital investment (vessels and terminals) but acknowledges that up to one quarter of that (\$418 million) may not materialize. WSF's Sensitivity Analysis of the Plan states:
 - i. Ferry fares may not provide increased revenues as planned (up to \$214 million shortfall);
 - ii. Labor arbitration awards are not included in expense projections (up to \$50 million shortfall)
 - iii. Fuel costs are estimated at 2.02/gallon with future increases ate general consumer price inflation rate, and projects \$144 million shortfall if fuel costs increase by another \$1.00. Yet, fuel already is \$3.00+/gallon.
- Further eroding the Plan's financial reliability is the steep cost inflation that is beginning to be felt throughout the transportation industry, with construction bids higher than anticipated for all jurisdictions. WSF's Sensitivity Analysis acknowledges that its vessel funding projections are probably short by up to 15%.

Thus, the Plan's projected new service levels (terminal improvements and vessel construction) do not represent reliable scenarios upon which its constituent communities can depend. It



seems inevitable that choices among the scenarios will have to be made, and the Plan does not provide guidance as to the priorities for those choices. As part of the short-term review, the Plan should include an updated financial analysis and service contingency plan.

Comment Date: 7/31/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Mike Sudduth
Organization: Vashon FAC

Comment:

The Vashon Ferry Advisory Committee has reviewed the Draft Long-Range Strategic Plan 2006-2030 and commends WSF on its commitment to meeting the needs of communities served by the ferry system.

We are concerned about several aspects of the report which – if not addressed – would lead to a substandard level of service on Vashon Island over the coming decades. Given that Vashon, as an island community, has no transportation alternative to the ferries, ensuring a reasonable and affordable level of service is absolutely critical. We hope, therefore, that you consider our recommendations with the utmost seriousness.

Restoration of I-695 Service Cuts

Before new service is added anywhere in the system, services levels on all routes should be restored to pre-I-695 levels.

No Substantial Improvements to North End Service Until 2015.

A critical issue for Vashon is the absence of a reasonable increase in service on the North End Triangle route until 2015. The modest increase in capacity associated with vessel upsizing in 2009 is a fraction of what is needed over the next decade to address the already-lengthy wait times during commute and evening hours and the anticipated growth in service levels needed to reasonably meet the needs of Vashon residents over the next decade. We question the assumption (page 15) that vehicle traffic in the Vashon Service area will grow by only 20 percent between 2003 and 2030. Our concern about the validity of this assumption is based on several factors. First, as the long range plan itself indicates (page 13), “ridership projections...are specific to a very narrow period: the 4-hour peak commute period on a Wednesday afternoon in May, which is assumed to be a typical day.” This, combined with the incomplete and unreliable data on current overloads on the Triangle route, suggests a somewhat crude measurement of current and future demand. Further, the small projected increase in vehicle traffic appears to be tied to an assumption of a 100% increase in walk-on traffic. We question whether even a substantial increase in walk-on traffic will result in such a small increase in vehicle traffic.

A solution in the near-to-mid-term can be found in accelerating construction of a second slip at Southworth and initiating shuttle service between Vashon and Southworth using the Hiyu or another small vessel. This would enable redeployment of the triangle fleet to provide more



frequent service on the Vashon-Fauntleroy and Southworth-Fauntleroy runs, where the demand is much greater. According to the long-range plan, the new Southworth slip is scheduled to be completed by 2010. Our question is, why can't this project be accelerated, given that WSF already has the funding in hand? And why can't at least a partial breakup of the triangle route (by initiating shuttle service between Vashon and Southworth) be put in place at the latest by 2010, if not earlier?

In the near term, WSF needs to figure out a way to restore the 10:55 p.m. sailing from Fauntleroy throughout the week and throughout the year. The current gap in service between the 10:15 p.m. and 11:40 p.m. sailings (except for Saturday-Sunday on the summer schedule) is unacceptable. We also request restoration of third boat service on weekends during the winter schedule as this is needed to minimize overloads that often cause problems for Vashon families attending off-island youth sports events and returning from essential shopping trips on weekend afternoons.

No Substantial Improvements to South End Service Until 2015

By proposing no increase in service levels or capacity on the Point Defiance-Tahlequah route until 2015, the long-range plan fails to address current or future demand for service at the south end. Mid-day and late evening service levels already are substandard, and we believe vehicle traffic will grow by more than the 17% anticipated in the plan for the period between 2003 and 2030. At a minimum, WSF needs to restore weekend and evening service immediately, which could help provide some near-term relief to the late night overloads at Fauntleroy. There are some in the community who want to keep the Rhododendron on the route. We support the plan to replace the Rhododendron with a larger vessel in 2015.

Rate Increases Require Further Discussion

The Vashon FAC strongly supports WSF's efforts to ensure adequate funding for capital investment. However, the Vashon FAC adamantly opposes an increase in fare levels beyond an 80% recovery rate without a far more detailed discussion about how the anticipated \$925 million in "excess subsidies" raised through 2.5% annual fare increases beyond 2008 would be spent. This discussion needs to include Vashon and other ferry communities, the Governor and members of the Legislature and should – once and for all – address the broader issues of an appropriate recovery rate and adequate state funding for WSF capital needs.

Conclusion

The Vashon FAC appreciates the time and effort WSF put into preparation of the long-range plan and into soliciting input from the Vashon community. We hope you will consider these recommendations seriously and in the collaborative spirit in which they're offered, and we look forward to seeing them implemented in the final report.



Comment Date: 7/30/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Rex Nelson
Organization: Southworth Ferry Advisory Committee, Kitsap Transit Citizen's Advisory Committee

Comment:

I am writing to say that our committee is not unified in their reaction to the Long Range Plan. I am in absolute disagreement with the letter sent by Marjorie Rees.

Ferry system plans, for the last ten years, have always included a two boat service from Southworth to Colman Dock beginning in about 2012. A couple of commute hour passenger only trips, as Kitsap Transit envisions, are not an adequate substitute. As always, I concur with this planning as the most efficient way to serve to greatest number of passengers the least cost per passenger.

Fauntleroy is not a destination in and of itself, and to force downtown passengers through there is a waste a ferry user's time and a hardship to many riders.

The Fauntleroy loading problem will not go away until it becomes a single destination dock for Vashon service. Yes, some will be inconvenienced, but not anymore than my wife and I are when we have to go through Fauntleroy on our way downtown.

The Kitsap Transit proposal involves of a sales tax increase that was defeated by the voters three years ago, as it will be whenever they choose to hold the election. There is little likelihood of passing a tax increase borne by 100% of t he people, but only benefiting 3%.

When we begin a public ferry advisory meeting, one of your personnel always begins by stating that we won't improve service by taking it from another dock. Please adhere to this and refuse the KRCC request to put the proposed second Southworth to downtown boat on the Bremerton route. The Southworth route serves an area of over 100,000 people that would be greatly inconvenienced if they had to access the ferry in Bremerton.

Comment Date: 7/31/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Vicki Mercer
Organization: Vashon Maury Island Community Council

Comment:

Attached is the formal response from Vashon Maury Island Community Council to the Washington State Ferries mandated Long Range Plan. We are earnest with our concerns and hope they will be weighed appropriately.



Comment Date: 7/30/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Jim English
Organization: Vashon Maury Island Community Council Vashon FAC

Comment:

On behalf of the Vashon-Maury Island community at large, let me begin by expressing how much we appreciate the opportunities WSF has afforded our island community to review and comment on the WSF Long-Range Strategic Plan for 2006–2030. Thank you all for expending the time and effort to do so, it means and says a lot. At those public meetings, you heard many opinions and concerns expressed by individual islanders regarding the draft plan; however, you have not yet heard from the Vashon-Maury Island Community Council (VMICC) as the representative body for the community. The Council's present comments and concerns follow:

Triangle Route Breakup Needs to Happen Sooner, not 2015

The breakup of the South Sound auto ferry triangle route and the addition of direct Southworth to downtown Seattle service would from our perspective significantly reduce traffic congestion at Fauntleroy and help alleviate the growing overloads between Vashon and Fauntleroy. Our concern is having to wait until 2015, per the draft plan, for the breakup to happen. We have concluded that this is unacceptable and will only further exacerbate the already strained loading issues at Fauntleroy and the growing wait times on both ends of the Vashon-Fauntleroy run.

Fauntleroy Toll Booth Congestion Needs Help

The City of Seattle's apparent constraint to expand the Fauntleroy terminal needs to be re-considered. The existing traffic load, with its impact on the Fauntleroy neighborhood, is a safety issue that needs to be addressed. We believe that any improvements that positively affect Fauntleroy congestion would help both commuters and the Fauntleroy community.

Restore Late Night Schedule Frequency at Fauntleroy

We urge you to consider all possible measures to relieve current congestion and overloads, even temporarily. The 10:15 p.m. run between Fauntleroy and Vashon is considerably overloaded, particularly on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday nights, due in large part to the hour and twenty-five minute gap ferry users must endure until the next run at 11:40 p.m.—a long wait and one most users try to avoid by using the 10:15 run to return to Vashon. We earnestly request restoration of the 10:50 p.m. run immediately and year-round. Doing so would help offset the loading problems now endured on these days by both ferry commuters and ferry staff.

Pt. Defiance to Tahlequah Should Not Be Forgotten

We were disappointed to see no direct discussion of the Tahlequah-Pt. Defiance route in the plan. Although the past elimination of multiple runs has resulted in a decline of ridership, we see growing demand for this route. In part this is because the run is an alternative to the overloads at the north end of the Island. The 2004 Business Survey showed that elimination of mid-afternoon service has had a significant negative effect for many island businesses, and has



resulted in much more load pressure during the P.M. peak period. The service levels and frequency are worse now than they were 30 years ago but with far more traffic.

We would definitely prefer to see restoration of service cuts on the Tahlequah- Pt. Defiance route rather than a dock expansion and/or use of larger boats. Many community members familiar with this route feel that continued use of the Rhododendron would provide far greater overall flexibility. With the planned development of the Ruston community, including a new shopping area, in the former ASARCO site, Vashon Islanders will no doubt increase their use of the Tahlequah/Pt. Defiance ferry.

Properly Coordinated Ferry-Bus Connections are Essential

A surprising result of the September, 2004 Transportation Needs Survey conducted by the VMICC Transportation Committee was that 52 percent of auto drivers who use the ferries indicated that they would use Metro service more if there was a bus at their destination within 10 minutes of their arrival. It's no secret that in recent years, WSF and Metro at Fauntleroy, and WSF and Pierce County Transit at Pt. Defiance have not had great success coordinating smoothly integrated connections between ferries and buses. This is a vitally important commuting public service need that demands immediate and continued attention to assure optimum schedule coordination. Anything less is a disservice to the commuter and to those working so hard at WSF, Metro, and Pierce Transit to make ferry-bus connections work seamlessly.

Help Us Maintain Vashon's Passenger Only Ferry (POF) Service

You are acutely aware of our community's desire/demand to maintain passenger only service between Vashon and downtown Seattle. As directed by the legislature, it would appear that WSF will likely not be the future provider of POF service. However, because of the recent history of private operators terminating service, we hope WSF will remain committed to fill the POF service need should that history repeat itself.

Tariffs and Farebox Recovery

Tariff policy must be addressed as part of the Long Range Plan. The stated goal of going beyond 80% fare box recovery to 100%-plus is totally unacceptable. The financial stress this would place on our and other Puget Sound communities is unrealistic. WSF and the Transportation Commission must go back to the Legislature for a more equitable solution that treats ferry service as the extension of the state highway system it is supposed to be.

Moreover, just exactly which 80 (or 100-plus) percent fare box recovery figure are we trying to achieve? Is it the one reflected in the 2002 Blue Ribbon study or some nebulous figure that will remain undefined so more and more fare increases can be justified to chase the mythical farebox recovery target? If so, this too is totally unacceptable.

Low Usage Projections Can Skew the Impact Numbers

We also want to stress that the essential services provided by King County, and dependent upon WSF service to get to and from Vashon, are vitally important to our island. We respect that you look to county planners for projections of population and demographics. However, we're not confident the true impact that these County services have on ferry usage to and from the island are being accurately reflected in those projections. Transferring garbage, treated sewage,



heavy equipment required for road building and maintenance, fuel products, etc. regularly bulge traffic counts that can not be accounted for from population projections alone. Please assure that these and the other seemingly transparent similar loading impacts are accurately reflected in your projections so they are properly accommodated for in your planning, scheduling and other models.

Public Process Can Always Be Improved

WSF planning must go beyond growth projections and take a proactive approach to meeting the needs of ferry-dependent communities. We urge greater community involvement at the earliest possible stages of any WSF planning process with the goal of creating a community/agency partnership instead of the all too common adversarial situation that manifest when the public gets involved much later down the planning path. Your acceptance of the data of our 2004 Business Survey and the Transportation Needs Survey that you have used as references for your Long Range Plan shows that working together can be beneficial.

Again, we appreciate the opportunity you have accorded us to respond. We look forward to expanded community participation in WSF planning.

Comment Date:

Contact Type: Form

Name: Ellen Kritzman

Organization:

Comment:

I have never been a commuter to downtown Seattle, but have used the PO boat on occasion. As this services is constricted, however, it will serve a smaller rider-ship, strictly commuter. May need to look at the projected every-half-hour boat Vashon-Fauntleroy to serve those needs, if that would eliminate subsidized, red-ink PO travel and allow car ferry rates to be more reasonable.

Comment Date: 4/26/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Ellen Kritzman

Organization:

Comment:

I applaud the end of the service triangle in the S. Sound-- wish it could happen sooner, but in conjunction, someone needs to make Seattle gov't see that certain Fauntleory improvement would also help alleviate their traffic woes; a win-win situation. Totally unrealistic.



Based on models, not reality. Use instead actual studies/surveys like those done by Vashon's Transportation Committee; take all segments of usage, including commercial, into account-- not just commuter. Funding that includes \$1 billion from excess farebox revenue that we allowed to exceed 100% totally out of line-- WSF uses Martha's Vineyard a model-- possibly like San Juan's tourist. Long routes but nothing like (??? Page cuts off)

S&C Sound Daily commute/commercial/student etc traffic. Should be more like 50%, closer to true transit approach. Riders will decline and change character. Current level-of-service standards unacceptable! Worse than 25 years ago (half the population?) for twice the price. Highest priority for Vashon-- RESTORATION OF SERVICE! Late evening at Fauntleroy; one boat at lease that stops at Vashon in afternoon, going from Southworth to Fauntleroy's early afternoon service in Tahlequah-Pt Defiance. [a suggestion was made to keep Rhody and be able to restore service. LOOK AT THIS OPTION-- OPEN YOUR MINDS TO OTHER WAYS TO ACHIEVE GOOD SERVICE LEVEL.

Comment Date: 5/2/2006
Contact Type: Form

Name: Cyndi Michelena
Organization:

Comment:

Other than the fact we need to wait till 2014, it will be a smart move to have a direct route to downtown Seattle from Southworth and will alleviate traffic in West Seattle. I hope that the issues surrounding Sedgwick being able to handle more traffic and not affect residents is addressed as well as environmental issues, like the nearby estuary. I didn't realize how complicated the ferry changes were-- involving so many other agencies and projects, like the proposed viaduct revamp. No, it seems like all the different agencies are trying to work from the same page.

Please continue to keep us informed as this process phase continues toward the beginning of suggested change to the system as we know it. It is appreciated and important, obviously, to our future community.

Comment Date: 4/4/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Jon Flora
Organization:

Comment:

1. Please help me understand the position of DOT and the ferry system leadership about



passenger-only boats. I ride the Vashon PO every day and find it to be an excellent way to get to work. I'm even glad to pay a premium price given the proximity of my workplace to Colman Dock.

It is my understanding that your argument against passenger only ferries is based on what is viewed as excessive operating costs. Given the comparative expenses associated with projects like Sound Transit along with the desire of our state/community leadership to reduce individual car travel, I do not understand why your plan calls for expanding car ferry capacity while abandoning PO service. As our state grows, the need will be there for both kinds of boats and Washington State Ferries is the entity that knows ferry service the best.

If the costs for operating PO boats are indeed excessive, the idea of letting some other municipality handle the little boats simply dumps the problem on someone else. That sets up a scenario where the other provider eventually eliminates the PO service which will effectively put more cars on the big boats and on our highways. That just doesn't make sense.

Please enlighten me because I just don't get it.

2. Why can't I buy my monthly pass at the Colman Dock PO booth? I know you're moving to the electronic system, but it doesn't make sense why I can't buy the pass at the place I walk by everyday. Even your ticket sellers can't seem to give me a good answer. Can you help?

I am an advocate for the ferry system and really think you do a great job. I'm just "missing the boat" on these issues. Thanks for your answers.

Comment Date: 4/5/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Robert Brumfield

Organization:

Comment:

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

Seattle Ferry Terminal in dire need of updating. Suggest more vendors-not one high.

3. Do you have other comments?

Build a light-rail from Port Townsend with stop continue on to Bainbridge Terminal Ferry Building-object to reduce auto traffic on ferries and roadways. Also run smaller and more frequent ferry to Seattle for passenger-only.



Comment Date: 4/4/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Richard Thomson
Organization:

Comment:

Please can we have direct service to Coleman Dock from Vashon!

Comment Date: 4/19/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Anonymous
Organization:

Comment:

There are still a lot of people that want to go to Fauntleroy east and south. If you have to get off on Vashon-are you guaranteed getting onto the next Fauntleroy boat? Let's get the state funding back even if \$30 tabs go away.

Comment Date: 4/18/2006
Contact Type: Form

Name: Anonymous
Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

Absolutely support the new triangle route. Folks who want Fauntleroy/Southworth can still do that leg.

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

3. Do you have other comments?

If WSF intends to stay at Fauntleroy, the state needs to build a state-of-the-art terminal to replace the oldest and least-environmentally responsible facility. I appreciated the above-board



responses. You folks seem to be trying. I also appreciated having the commissioner in attendance.

Comment Date: 4/18/2006
Contact Type: Form

Name: Anonymous
Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

Anything that will reduce ferry traffic at Fauntleroy is great. I haven't see anything about funding which could mitigate the safety issues on Fauntleroy caused by ferry traffic. Please consider funding several pedestrian-activated lights in the Lincoln Park section. The ferry traffic does not stop for pedestrians in the crosswalks.

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

3. Do you have other comments?

Please require cars in the ferry queue to turn off their engines.

Comment Date: 4/18/2006
Contact Type: Form

Name: Anonymous
Organization:

Comment:

The proposed service changes are helpful to reduce and limit car traffic going to and leaving the Fauntleroy ferry dock. The car traffic leaving the dock travels too fast and is a hazard to pedestrians wanting to cross Fauntleroy Avenue. Additional lighted cross walks on this street would be helpful. An even better solution would be to eliminate the Fauntleroy dock entirely.



Comment Date: 4/4/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Joe Laing
Organization:

Comment:

All I ask for is that the WSF and Metro (and Sound Transit, route to the airport) work together to ensure timely connections at the Fauntleroy ferry terminal.

I've repeatedly asked for small changes to the bus schedules that currently miss ferry schedules by less than 5 minutes, particularly when coming from Seattle to Fauntleroy without success, but nothing is ever heard back.

Comment Date: 4/12/2006
Contact Type: Form

Name: Anonymous
Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

It leaves the south end of Vashon with inadequate service. Service cuts from I-695 should be restored BEFORE adding additional boats.

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

Fauntleroy constraints are accurately portrayed.

Comment Date: 5/11/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Sage Smythe
Organization:

Comment:

Can you work with Metro so that the Bus #54 will meet with 5:00 p.m. ferry leaving Fauntleroy? Both local and express 54 miss boat by a few minutes every day and this adds an hour to Southworth people since we wait an additional 20 minutes at Vashon for no apparent reason



when we do the 5:40 pm sailing. Also, why is there extra waiting time at Vashon on the 5:40 pm sailing. How about the waiting time be at Southworth so Southworth people can get home?

The #54 metro bus EXPRESS needs to be made more of an EXPRESS. It is a puddle jumper and duplicates many of the same stops as the regular 54. Please work with Metro on this issue.

Also, start working with Kitsap Transit so that all the passes are incorporated into one. It was ridiculous that Harper Church people was hit with a \$33 bus pass just to ride a few blocks.

Also, instead of making all the price increases on the passengers, I say hit the drivers hard with the price increases and no further price increases for the walkons.

Also, I would like one ferry pass that would fit all the boats instead of different ones. I don't think it is right that if I have a Southworth pass that is worthless on the Bremerton run. I think if I show my Southworth pass at Bremerton, that something should be taken off the Bremerton fare. The same should apply for Passenger ferry boats also.

The way you are running the ferry system now, you are bleeding the turnips. Walk-on passengers are doing everything right environmentally, why should they be taken to the cleaners?

Comment Date: 4/26/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Eric Gunther
Organization:

Comment:

(Southworth-Seattle re-route)
2011 is too long to wait for this. Are you kidding me?? I have been personally waiting for this since 1998 when I first moved there. Tim Eyman took care of that. If you guys can't do it let someone else step in that can. And sooner.

Comment Date: 3/7/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Ole Hovland
Organization:

Comment:

I'm a South Kitsap resident. I don't commute but use the Southworth Ferry, on average, a couple times a month; more than that at certain times. I use the ferry when I want to get



downtown and would walk on a passenger ferry, but think that a car ferry direct to downtown (which I would also walk on) would provide the best service. Now I usually drive on to the Southworth Ferry and drive/park downtown.

I understand that your study found the car ferry feasible, but that some representing Seattle feel that the additional traffic could not be handled properly. Here are some points. I'm sure you've thought of all of them, so just add a little more weight to them on your list.

Most people have to drive onto the current route to get where they are going. I know several commuters and they drive on or ride van pools. No one, of course, is going within walking distance of Fauntleroy. Many would walk on to a Southworth-Downtown ferry.

Traffic through West Seattle is bad and getting worse too.

The coming transportation links are all going downtown making walking on more attractive to people going beyond walking distance there. There's traffic on this side too. SR 16/3 from Port Orchard to Bremerton is the major bottle neck over here and then you have to navigate downtown Bremerton to get to the Seattle Ferry. Some of that traffic could better go to Southworth with a quicker total trip. Ferry arrivals can be staggered. The road infrastructure to move cars to and from Coleman Dock will be there when the rush from the other ferries eases up.

Service with an auto ferry would presumably be more frequent and with longer hours; serving more people than just commuters. A lot of the infrastructure (three slips) is already there and is already planned to be upgraded. The walk on passengers on an auto ferry can use the facilities and vendors in the main Coleman Dock terminal instead of having minimal offerings at a passenger terminal. The vendors could use the extra business.

Comment Date: 4/21/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Steve Townsend

Organization:

Comment:

I currently ride in a vanpool from Southworth to Fauntleroy with a final destination of Renton. My commute would be really impacted by the proposed change to route vehicle ferries to downtown Seattle. I have reviewed the web site, but could not find any traffic count information that would support the vehicle Southworth-Colman Dock proposal. Forcing non-Seattle traffic to go through downtown would not be beneficial to anyone.

Have you checked with the local vanpool agencies to see where their ferry vans go?



Comment Date: 4/27/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Frances Roth
Organization:

Comment:

While it will be nice to have regular ferry service from Southworth to downtown Seattle, I shutter to think of the problems caused by the extra car traffic. That area is already a zoo and trying to get to the freeway from there, especially on a game day, is a major headache. In addition to the Southworth to downtown route but instead of the two boat service from Vashon to Fauntleroy and the one boat shuttle from Southworth to Vashon, would it be possible to continue to run the triangle route? Even if only every other boat made the added trip to Southworth, this would give people in Kitsap a way to avoid downtown traffic when they don't need to be downtown? I suppose they could still take the shuttle to Vashon and then the ferry to Fauntleroy but that would make for traffic problems at Vashon (to say nothing of the extra time required).

One other point - there are currently van pools that gather on the ferry and then pick up their van from that little parking lot at Fauntleroy. Is there a van pool staging area at Coleman dock? If not, could there be?

Comment Date: 4/18/2006
Contact Type: Form

Name: Anonymous
Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

I would really like to see a Southworth to downtown ferry happen, the sooner the better! People I know who live in Port Orchard would also like to see this happen.

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

I would not like to see higher ferry charges they are too high already.

3. Do you have other comments?

The sooner the better!!!



Comment Date: 4/26/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Don Row
Organization:

Comment:

I strongly agree with Mr. Ottenback who was quoted in today's (4/26/06) Kitsap Sun concerning the rerouting of the Southworth ferry from Fauntleroy to downtown Seattle. There is nothing in West Seattle for commuters to do and public transportation there is horrible. You are forced to take a car across the ferry to get to where you want to go, which for me is almost always downtown.

Meanwhile, downtown Seattle has jobs, nightlife, restaurants, the Seattle Center, sporting events and better mass transit (although it could and should be much better). I believe your current projection estimates are all incorrect. If there was fast (ie. Not having to stop at Vashon), reliable service from Southworth to downtown, the ridership would explode. It seems to me that this process could and should be greatly accelerated. 2014 is a long, long time to wait! Thank you!

Comment Date: 4/20/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Carl Coyle
Organization:

Comment:

Thank you for your sincerity, and interest in trying to solve problems, in addition to attending the meeting.....I may have been impolite, by seeming caustic attitude, but I too, am sincere .After reading the info. at home, I feel quite strongly that best service AND a good long-term alternative would be 2 boat Southworth/Seattle(1 to Colman and 1 to Faunt).I will think more, and please extend to your cohorts that I do appreciate their time and effort. There have been too many meetings(25 years) and too little accommodation of Southworth and So. Kitsap..... The greater need, and underservice exist at Southworth.

Thank you again for taking 'no offense.'



Comment Date: 4/19/2006
Contact Type: Form

Name: Lloyd Gorman
Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

Should be done sooner rather than later. Feeder roads need to be improved with increased ferry service.

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

3. Do you have other comments?

Any Southworth Terminal modifications need to include a passenger-only walk-on ramp.

Comment Date: 4/5/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Ebba Jo Sexton
Organization:

Comment:

I have lived in Port Orchard since 2001. This town is between the ferry at Bremerton and the one at Southworth. Presently we use the Southworth/Fauntleroy ferry more because it has more sailings during the day. We are both retired, so do not need to go to Seattle during the busiest commute times. However, we have found it difficult as either foot passengers (on the Bremerton ferry) or in our car, to get a ferry in the middle of the afternoon or late morning.

There doesn't seem to be any language in the LRplan that deals with improving Bremerton ferry availability. The city is desperately trying to revive itself and needs MORE ferry runs, not LESS, as has been the tendency in the past 4 years. I don't think the private/public foot ferry will get off the ground. It has already dropped one run for financial reasons (they are very expensive to ride for retired citizens) and the foot ferry did not have any runs except at the beginning of the day and in the late afternoon. I hope you get the gist of this rambling letter....Bremerton needs more auto ferry runs, since the good people of Bainbridge Island continue to thwart anything faster with lawsuits and worries about shore erosion.



Comment Date: Unknown
Contact Type: Form

Name: Anonymous
Organization:

Comment:

I support idea of

- 1) Vashon to Fauntleroy car ferry
- 2) Run Southworth car ferry directly downtown. This assumes car capacity and frequency increases/stays the same.

Comment Date: 4/19/2006
Contact Type: Form

Name: Travis Baker
Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

Ferry straight to downtown Seattle is a great idea. I rarely use the ferry at Southworth, but when I do, I'm always headed downtown.

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

The assumption that passenger-only ferries are worth the money is flawed. Let passengers travel on the car boats.

Comment Date: 4/18/2006
Contact Type: Form

Name: Anderson
Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

Opposed to elimination of car ferry-Fauntleroy to Southworth.

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding



framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

Not all people who live in Kitsap County work in downtown Seattle-some south and east. Travel from Kitsap and Olympic Peninsula's to and return from Sea-Tac is now reasonable in time, effort and cost. We live on west coast, many trips are to the east and frequent departures chosen are 6:00 a.m.

Comment Date: 4/19/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Jim Heyvelt

Organization:

Comment:

I attended the long range planning meeting held 4-19-06 , held at the John Sedgewick school in South Kitsap.

The subject is planning for auto/passenger ferry service from Southworth to Seattle . I support the plan as written. with the following concern. There is a need to improve state highway 160 to handle additional traffic that will be generated. Southworth drive ,which is a county road to the Southworth ferry terminal, is a very ecologically sensitive road between the Harper Dock and the Harper Estuary. Residents aware of the Estuary and road way are attempting to place this location on Governor Gregoires list of sensitive sites to be rehabilitated. This is part of the governors plan to restore Puget Sound. Thus there is a need to minimize traffic on this section of road.

In addition , the pending vote for passenger only ferry service , by Kitsap Transit from Southworth to Seattle, If approved could draw enough passengers from the WSF ferries to make meeting fare box recovery ratios difficult. If operation of passenger only ferries proves to make the route not viable. I would suggest that no new route be established .

If no new route was established I would suggest that a Walk on, vanpool only route be left to transport people to the Fauntleroy terminal from Southworth. In addition I would suggest Vanpools be increased from Vashon



Comment Date: 4/5/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: August Mecl
Organization:

Comment:

Under the section from the website stating, "The Plan must take into account public and customer perspectives." I'm concerned that the passenger only traffic from Southworth dock with the ultimate destination of Seattle is not being accurately represented. If the AM traffic survey from 2003 is your baseline, then I'd suggest that your final analysis will be flawed and a more recent survey should be used to support your findings. I believe the recent growth in the Kitsap Peninsula and it's projected growth should be taken into account.

Comment Date: 4/19/2006
Contact Type: Form

Name: Evelina Tabisula
Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

I feel this is great! However, when planning changes, take into consideration the environment and the growth in Kitsap, of course, the possibility of NASCAR race track in South Kitsap. The Southworth and Seattle route should happen sooner.

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

All of the above are very important-I would like to see the Southworth/Seattle route be more profitable; the wait area should be more passenger friendly; have that overhead loading/unloading-this will make passenger traffic easier.

3. Do you have other comments?

Would like to see the route Southworth/Seattle go into effect sooner.



Comment Date: 4/5/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Anonymous

Organization:

Comment:

I can not for the life of me figure you people out. Why can't you release the passenger only ferry to the private sector?

You are waiting till 2014 to add direct service from Southworth to downtown. Most of the older commuters (which are numerable) will be retired or dead by then. Your planning seems somewhat dubious at best. You want the general public under your complete control. You are so intent on delaying the foot ferries that the general public must suffer because of your little Napoleon power need. The foot dragging just astound me on how you don't want foot ferries but then you don't want to let go of the control of them!!!!

You people talk a good story on how the state is trying to cut down on traffic congestion but that's all it is is talk. You don't want decreased traffic. You want to continue to come to voters and cry broke and say how the congestion is getting worse.

If you would let private industry take over the foot ferries it would cut down on traffic but then you would loose control and we all know we can't have that now can we.

I am taking a early retirement so I can get away from this backward thinking and small mind-set mentality. I hope allot of others do the same and leave this backward state!!!

Comment Date: 7/6/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Doug Pine

Organization:

Comment:

With regard to your long range planning for Point Defiance/Tahlequah, it makes sense to keep the Rhody in service past 2014, and in the short term work to find ways to return service to pre-2000 levels. Moving an Evergreen Class boat to the run would cost more than keeping the Rhody and increasing service. Labor alone would increase substantially due to increased crewing requirements (E. State: Master, C Mate, 3 AB, 3 OS, CE, Oiler, Wiper vs.. Rhody: Master, C Mate, 2 AB, 2 OS, CE, Oiler). Fuel consumption and maintenance costs will also increase. The slight growth projections support keeping the smaller vessel on the run. Increasing service from 16 to 20 hours per day would support the increase in ridership over the years while providing better service for Islanders on the south end.



Comment Date: 4/4/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Mary Beck
Organization:

Comment:

Why do commuters in Tacoma to Vashon not have a meeting site?

III. Central Sound Corridor



Comment Date: 7/21/2006

Contact Type: Letter

Name: Mayor Greg Nickels

Organization: City of Seattle

Comment:

Thank you for providing the City of Seattle the opportunity to comment on Washington State Ferries Draft Long Range Strategic Plan, 2006-2030. We share the goal to provide continued ferry access for the growing populations of Kitsap County and Vashon Island to Seattle's Colman Dock hub and Fauntleroy terminal. Seattle's Department of Transportation and Department of Planning and Development have been working closely with WSF on the Colman Dock replacement project. The city has been involved in early planning due to the importance of this as a multi-modal hub and gateway to Seattle's Center City. This plan update has significant implications for future ferry riders, the management of traffic through Seattle's Center City, as well as for how Seattle's two ferry terminals will continue to be operated and redeveloped into the future.

The draft plan projects that 70% of all new vehicle trips during peak period are expected to be on routes operating out of Colman Dock. The proposed service changes have significant implications on what facilities are needed to accommodate that growth and how negative impacts can be mitigated. This letter provides the City of Seattle's comments on the draft plan.

Last Fall Grace Crunican, Seattle's Director of Transportation, sent a letter (copy attached) to WSF requesting that critical information be included in the Draft Plan. Many of these policy and technical considerations are not addressed in the draft plan. I would like these previously identified issues to be fully considered in the final plan. In addition we request that the following be incorporated into the final plan's recommendations:

A. Provide a phased service option from Southworth to Colman Dock.

New service from Southworth to Colman should be phased to: provide needed access from South Kitsap; minimize the negative transportation of an auto ferry; and to delay the major capital investment that would be required by a new auto boat route. The phased option includes 3 components:

1. Passenger-only service would be continued to Vashon by a county district or some other entity with a more reasonable transition plan than the July 2007 assumption in the draft plan. New Southworth passenger-only service to Downtown would be provided by 2008, possibly by an operator other than WSF. This service, along with the draft plan's recommendations for a Kingston to Colman passenger-only service to Downtown would be provided by 2008, possibly by an operator other than WSF. This service, along with the draft plan's recommendations for a Kingston to Colman passenger-only service route (by a non-WSF operator), would help alleviate future demand at Bainbridge.

2. Southworth to Fauntleroy car service would be maintained at the existing frequency, then be reduced over time with the introduction of better access to Downtown via passenger only service. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures (such as pricing, vanpool



priority, etc.) would be employed for the Fauntleroy-Southworth route to minimize or reduce growth in vehicular traffic at the Fauntleroy dock.

3.A Bremerton third boat should be higher priority over a new auto boat form Southworth, consistent with Kitsap County's growth management plans and ferry service priorities.

There are several reasons for this request:

1.The City is concerned about the impacts of a third route at Colman Dock. The increased loading and unloading of boats would be difficult to balance against other access needs along Alaskan Way.

2.A new auto route would be difficult during the construction of the Alaskan Way Tunnel Replacement project, and

3. Assuming the draft plan's financial assumptions are optimistic, the phased approach would provide greatly needed access from Southworth to Downtown and relief for Fauntleroy if the assumptions are not viable.

The City previously requested that this option be studied. We believe all elements of the option need thorough evaluation to see how they meet travel demand in both the mid-term (5-15 years) as well as the longer-term when land use and travel patterns could greatly change.

B. Analysis of local transportation impacts form Colman Dock is absent in the draft plan.

The plan proposes three passenger-vehicle routes with a total of seven ferries an concludes that this is the maximum throughput that can be accommodated at Colman Dock (p.24). No analysis about the impacts to Seattle's landside transportation network is provided to support this conclusion. It is crucial that his analysis be completed prior to concluding that service increases are viable at Colman Dock.

C. Supporting transit service needs should be included in the plan.

Additional transit service will be needed to serve the significant projected walk-on passenger growth. WSF should work with Metro and other appropriate transit agencies to determine these needs and include discussions of tem in the plan.

D. Include other waterborne transit operator's plans into growth planning assumptions.

South Sound passenger-only ferry ridership potential needs additional discussion (regardless of operator) and should include data form Kitsap Transit, King County or other interested operators.

E. Incorporate TDM strategies that would support growth in ridership while minimizing the vehicle growth that drives expensive capital solutions.

Effective TDM strategies could include pricing and fare structure revisions as well as incentives to encourage walk-on passenger traffic (such as convenient transit connections and programs). Such strategies strongly support adopted regional, county and local planning priorities.

If and when you do consider an auto boat form Southworth, the plan must address the impacts to Seattle including impacts to Seattle including impacts to our City streets, and the off-site



impacts of queuing. WSF must propose methods to manage demand and minimize the dock footprint over water. Long term sustainability and ability to operate terminal with increasing congested downtown is a key concern.

We look forward to working closely with Washington State Ferries as the final plan is developed. If you have any questions regarding the city's comments, please feel free to contact my office or the Seattle Department of Transportation Director Grace Crunican at 684-5000.

Comment Date: 5/26/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Will Maupin

Organization: Bremerton City Council & Kitsap Transit Commission

Comment:

I have the following comment about the WSF draft long-range strategic plan:

I believe that the state has still not gone far enough in defining the role of WSF in the passenger only ferry (POF) business. I believe that WSF runs car ferries because they are an extension of the state highway system. No such rationale exists for the state to fund and operate passenger only ferries. I believe that passenger only ferries are a mass transit system, similar to buses, trains, monorail, etc. and therefore should be run by a transit agency. As with other forms of mass transit, any operating subsidies should come from local taxes.

Failure to make a clear policy statement about the state's role in passenger only ferries will seriously hinder the attempts by transit agencies to secure local funding in the form of tax dollars to subsidize operations. It needs to be clear that any tax support for POF operation needs to come from the local community and not from the state. Also, since we now know that private operators cannot operate at a profit, especially in competition with WSF, it needs to be clear to the public that POF service will not exist without local subsidies.

The WSF system should have a policy of cooperation (versus competition) with the transit agencies attempts to develop good, high speed POF service across Puget Sound.

Comment Date: 7/31/2006

Contact Type: Letter

Name: Councilmembers Nezaam Tooloee, Chris Snow, Debbie Vancil

Organization: Bainbridge Island City Council, WSF Ad Hoc Committee

Comment:

The City of Bainbridge Island (COBI) commends Washington State Ferries (WSF) for seeking public comment on its Long-Range Plan ("Plan"). The City Council's Ad Hoc WSF Committee is



pleased to offer these comments. As a member of the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council COBI has already contributed to the comments filed by that organization.

In the additional comments that follow we wish to focus on issues that have particular bearing on the interests of Bainbridge Island and how it fits into the transportation network for Kitsap County. These comments may also be of interest to other Kitsap County communities such as Bremerton, Kingston, Poulsbo, and Suquamish, which are also served by WSF system.

1. The financial foundation of the Plan should be carefully reviewed in light of the findings of the comprehensive review of WSF finances that was required by the Legislature but has not yet been completed.

We credit WSF for acknowledging that its Plan could face significant financial shortfalls in meeting its growing operating expenses or projected capital expenditures. Many critical factors beyond WSF's control (e.g., substantial escalations in fuel costs, legislative mandates for fare box recovery, reduced rider-ship with higher fares, and emergence of passenger-only ferry service) could materially affect WSF's finances in the next several years.

A significant slice of WSF's projected capital expenditures relates to its Bainbridge Island passenger terminal and maintenance facility, and Island residents will generate a substantial share of WSF fare box revenue. We believe that further development of the Plan should not occur until the comprehensive review of WSF's finances has been completed. Further substantive development of the Plan before that review is finished could result in a plan that lacks economic credibility.

We urge WSF to consider and act on the following comments as the comprehensive review of its finances is being completed and while the Plan is undergoing further development over the next few years.

2. Ridership growth projections in the Plan, particularly on the Bainbridge Island route, should be reexamined to reflect more credible growth.

The Plan shows an increase of about 70% in walk-on passengers and 30% in vehicles over the next 20 years on the Bainbridge Island route. This contrasts sharply with a decline in ridership on this route every year for the last 6 years--in part due to substantially higher fares. Meanwhile, the region has experienced significant growth in population--almost 100,000 in King County, 75,000 in Pierce County, 10,000 in Kitsap County, and 2,000 on Bainbridge Island.

This downward trend in ridership is likely to be compounded by factors beyond WSF's control such as escalated fuel costs and commensurate increases in fares; even higher fares mandated to recover even more operating and capital costs; accelerating retirement of baby boomers across the whole region; more widespread use of telecommuting and flexible work arrangements; the emergence of passenger-only ferries operated by other agencies; and concerted effort by cities across Kitsap County to promote economic development. These forces are sure to materially alter the demand for WSF's service in the coming years.

WSF should reexamine the assumptions in the Plan for growth in ridership across its system in collaboration with the communities involved, especially Bainbridge Island. Otherwise, it risks developing a plan that will be out of phase with the real economic and demographic forces that are actually shaping the region (and demand for ferry service).



3. Capital expenditures for WSF's Bainbridge Island passenger terminal should be based on more realistic projections for growth in ridership and closely coordinated with the island's effort to design an integrated overall urban ferry district.

While the Plan says that the projected passenger terminal capital expenditures are not in connection with providing greater service, it also states that this investment is needed to support significantly more traffic (i.e., 70% more passengers and 30% more vehicles over the next 20 years) through the terminal.

Moreover, along with implementation of its award-winning Winslow Tomorrow vision, COBi is starting to develop an overall urban design for its whole ferry district, which includes the passenger terminal and WSF's other Bainbridge Island properties and facilities. We look forward to working with WSF in this effort, as discussed in our recent meetings and as summarized in our letter of June 28.

\$. The intensity of service planned for Kitsap County, especially on the Bainbridge, Bremerton and Kingston routes, does not appear to reflect local policies and priorities and should be reconsidered in close collaboration with communities involved across Kitsap County.

The Plan proposed devoting considerable capital to the expansion of the Winslow passenger terminal and to increasing the capacity of ferries on this particular route for foot passengers. This will lead in turn to further considerable investment by WSDOT to expand the capacity of Highway 305, the only facility identified in the Plan as having a potential capacity constraint. It will also require Kitsap Transit to invest in more bus service along Highway 305 to move even more passengers from throughout Kitsap County to and from the Winslow passenger terminal.

We urge WSF to reconsider this approach and instead put more resources into providing greater service on the Bremerton and Kingston routes in the next few years. As the Plan says explicitly, adding service to the Bremerton or Kingston route is an effective method for drawing ridership away from the Bainbridge route. Improving service to Kingston and Bremerton will better serve residents across Kitsap County, who would already opt to use the Bremerton or Kingston routes if only more service were available on those routes.

WSF should consider making increased service to Bremerton its #1 priority in the next several years. The recently remodeled Bremerton passenger terminal is served by a major highway and will soon get a dedicated tunnel to streamline increased traffic. Bremerton is the designated urban center of Kitsap County and is actively seeking to attract more residents, employers, and tourism over the next several years.

5. As WSF reconsiders the Plan based on public comment, we urge the Legislature to make greater subsidies available for passenger-only service and to adopt a policy of putting more capital into smaller, more efficient boats and less capital into expensive terminals and maintenance facilities.

Along with expanding WSF's service on the Bremerton route and adding a Kingston-Seattle route, we urge the Legislature to encourage WSF to develop plans for a Bainbridge-Seattle passenger-only ferry service. We also urge the Legislature to devote a greater share of available funding to subsidies for passenger-only service throughout the system. This is a necessary complement to the mixed passenger/vehicle service that WSF already provides.



As WSF introduces smaller, more efficient boats, the requirement for larger and more costly terminals should moderate. Most ferry users-particularly commuters-value more frequent sailings much more than any other features (say the length of time to cross the sound or the variety of services at the terminal).

6. While it may take several years to develop the Plan to the satisfaction of all stakeholders, it is vital for WSF to work with local governments and communities now to manage ferry-driven surges of traffic along Highway 305 in Bainbridge Island, Poulsbo and Suquamish.

Most riders who use WSF's Bainbridge route know that traffic along Highway 305 backs up and slows to a mere crawl as vehicles coming off the fully loaded ferries during the peak hours of 3:00 P.M. and 7:00 P.M. are added to the regular volume of traffic. Going just six miles from the WSF ramp to the other side of the Agate Passage Bridge can easily take 30 minutes or more. The same slowing of traffic to a crawl occurs to a lesser extent between the peak hours of 6:00 A.M. and 9:00 A.M. in the opposite direction.

Experts agree that neither the bridge nor the highway is near capacity; rather, the problem is in the way traffic lights (roughly a dozen in Bainbridge Island, Poulsbo, and Suquamish together) slow down traffic flow. Expanding the capacity of the highway or the bridge will not solve the problem. The solution for a good many years, if not decades, is to remove impediments to the smooth and rapid flow of ferry traffic off the island and along the highway.

We hope our comments are helpful to WSF and to the Legislature in reconsidering and revising the Plan, and to other communities that rely on ferry service as they consider making comments of their own. As always, we look forward to a productive relationship with WSF in shaping decisions that impact all of us.

Comment Date: 8/4/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Stephen Clifton

Organization: City of Edmonds

Comment:

With the help of my fellow directors and staff copied on this e-mail, I prepared the attached letter in response to the Washington State Ferries (WSF) 2006 Draft Long Range Plan. The letter highlights a number of significant issues including the following:

Coordination between WSDOT Highways and WSF

Timing highway and ferry improvements within a similar timeframe rather than independently

Addressing upland impacts, intersection/segment Level Of Service (LOS), and associated capital costs

Analyzing conditions along the SR104 corridor and other roadway segments and intersections as part of a Route Development Plan (RDP) which identifies safety, operational, and capacity



constraints along these corridors, in addition to noise impacts, and recommend solutions including intersection improvements and solutions for the corridor

Asking WSDOT and WSF to develop a funding program to address future infrastructure needs along the corridors leading to the existing Main Street and future Edmonds Crossing terminals

Questions are also raised about WSF's projected overall budget as it relates to Edmonds Crossing and WSF's position on a construction timeline as it relates to funding from non WSDOT/WSF sources.

A hard copy of the original letter is also being sent. If you have any questions, please call me or send an e-mail. I hope you have a great weekend.

Comment Date: 7/31/2006

Contact Type: Letter

Name: Mayor Gary Haakenson

Organization: City of Edmonds

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to present information on the Washington State Ferries Draft Long-Range Strategic Plan 2006-2030 to the City Council on May 2, 2006 and hosting an open house at the South Snohomish County Senior Center on May 10, 2006 to present information and solicit comments on the plan. As requested, City staff have collectively reviewed the plan. WE have also reviewed a May 9, 2006 letter from Mukilteo in response to their review of the plan. As such, we offer the following comments on behalf of the City.

1. According to the draft plan, "Washington State Ferries operates ferry service from Edmonds to Kingston, providing access to the Olympic Peninsula. This is one of the busiest commuter ferry terminals in Puget Sound as well as one of the major access points from the east side of Puget Sound to the west." The following observations relate directly to this statement:

-The plan formally recognizes that the Edmonds-Kingston run will grow as fast or faster than even the Seattle runs in the coming years (by 89% by 2030 as cited in the draft plan).

-Reasons for the growth are: 1) Snohomish county's population will grow 63% between 2000 and 2030, going from 606,000 to 985,000; 2) Kitsap county will grow 54% in the same timeframe; however, population outstrips job growth there, thus Kitsap will remain (or become more of) a bedroom community with residents commuting cross-sound to King and Snohomish Counties for employment; 3) WSF is looking to siphon ferry traffic from Seattle-Bainbridge and redirect it to the Edmonds-Kingston run.

2. The City concurs with comments #1 and #5 of the May 9, 2006 letter from Mukilteo. Specifically, we agree that Washington State Ferries (WSF) and Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) highways need to work closely to plan for, and time highway and ferry improvements within, a similar timeframe rather than independently. It is imperative that highways and ferry terminals provide adequate capacity to address peak transportation needs



well into the future in order to minimize transportation-related impacts within communities that host ferry terminals.

3. The City of Edmonds is highly concerned about upland impacts, intersection/segment level of service (LOS), and associated capital costs to address these issues. The plan needs to include intersection and segment LOS information along those corridors that result in an increase in future ferry traffic and their associated costs and funding source(s) should also be identified within the plan. Impacts created primarily during off-loading periods can cause significant impacts to intersections along those corridors serving the existing ferry terminal and planned Edmonds Crossing Multimodal facility.

4. Of particular concern to the City is WSF's statement on page iv of the draft plan that "A third vessel" will be added to Edmonds-Kingston in 2010 in the summer and 2012 year-round. This addition will address vehicle LOS on this route and help siphon traffic from Seattle-Bainbridge." This is the first time the City has been informed that WSF plans to siphon traffic from the Seattle-Bainbridge run. It is unclear to us whether the addition of a third ferry is primarily intended to address vehicle LOS (and a byproduct of this improvement is to attract traffic from Seattle-Bainbridge), or whether the third ferry is specifically intended to draw additional traffic to the Edmonds-Kingston run. This should be clarified.

The City is highly concerned about the impacts to various roadway segments and intersections that will arise from an increase in vehicular traffic associated with ferry operations. Impacts will be significant on the obvious feeder roadways, such as SR 104 (from Main Street to Interstate 5), Main Street, Caspers Street, 196th Street, ect., and incremental impacts will be felt on other minor roads within the larger interconnected street system.

If demand is primarily related to only natural growth factors (e.g., increased population and traffic in Kitsap Col.), then we understand why WSF wants to increase service via added vessels: this could possibly help minimize vehicle queues in Edmonds. If, on the other hand, demand is also a function of available service and boat wait times, then adding a third boat may actually contribute to an increase in demand beyond what the natural increase along would indicate. The plan's reference to "siphoning" traffic from Seattle-Bainbridge seems to support this last possibility.

Regardless of the reasoning for the changes being proposed, we continue to have concerns with traffic impacts from adding service. What the City is specifically requesting is for WSDOT and WSF to analyze conditions along the SR 104 corridor and other roadway segments and intersections as part of a Route Development Plan (RDP) that identifies future safety, operational, and capacity constraints along these corridors, in addition to noise impacts, and recommends solutions including intersection improvements and ITS solutions for the corridor. Additionally, the City is asking WSDOT and WSF to develop a funding program to address future infrastructure needs along the corridors leading to the existing Main Street and future Edmonds Crossing terminals.

5. On page 53 of the draft plan, Edmonds Crossing is identified as costing \$113.9 M in year of expenditure dollars. As the project is currently estimated to cost \$171M in 2006 dollars, how did WSF determine \$113.9M to be the project's cost?

6. Page 54 of the draft plan contains a statement that "about 1/3 of the \$113.9M amount is



covered by the legislature's capital commitment." This doesn't seem to square with the \$58M (current dollars) the legislature has committed to the project (as opposed to relying on nickel dollars of the 2005 Transportation partnership dollars).

7. The draft plan states that WSF is short about \$410M for capital construction through 2030. How does this relate to the \$113.9M number referred in the draft plan for Edmonds Crossing?

8. Is WSF relying on Regional Transportation Investment District (RTID) funding to help pay for Edmonds Crossing or does the \$410M needed in capital reflect all of WSF's needs?

9. If Edmonds Crossing stays on the Snohomish County RTID list at the current rate, and RTID does pass next year, would WSDO and WSF consider accelerating construction?

If RTID fails in 2007, and then Snohomish County assembles their own RTID (which they can do if TRID fails in 2007) and it passes with Edmonds Crossing money becoming available in 2008, would WSDOT and WSF consider accelerating construction?

If you have any questions, please contact me via email or phone.

Comment Date: 5/25/2006

Contact Type: Letter

Name: Commissioner Chris Endresen

Organization: Kitsap County Board of Commissioners

Comment:

I wish to lend my full support to the Kingston Ferry Advisory Committee's recommendations regarding the "Washington State Ferries' Draft Long-Range Strategic Plan 2006-2030".

The Kingston Ferry Advisory Committee has had discussions with the Kingston community, which earnestly supports the addition of ferries to the route as described in the Plan. I concur with their concerns about the impact of ferry traffic congestion in Kingston and excessive fare increases. I agree with their recommendation that schedule coordination between WSF and county transportation systems should be enhanced, and that close collaboration between WSF and Kitsap Transit is essential to successful passenger-only ferry service in Kingston. In addition I wish to stress the need for the ferry system and the State highway division to coordinate improvements necessary to allow the Kingston Community to thrive.

Thank you for preparing this Plan for the Kingston community; I request that WSF consider the issues discussed in Kingston Ferry Advisory Committee's well-reasoned correspondence.



Comment Date: 3/28/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Kynan Patterson

Organization: WSF

Comment:

Thanks for the presentation today on the Draft Long-Range Strategic Plan. I just wanted to mention something that your probably aware of, and that is right now the schedule for the Edmonds Crossing project is shown to have construction beginning in July of 2011, and having the new terminal completed in July of 2014. Your draft plan shows a 3rd boat being introduced to the Edmonds-Kingston run in 2012, and would be an inconsistency with our overall WSF message regarding Edmonds.

Just a note, the July 2014 construction completion is for the full build out of the new terminal and would include 3 slips at Edmonds, an option for a two phased construction of the terminal includes a first phase that builds the new terminal with two slips (should satisfy the 3 boat run). At this time we're still on the order of \$50 Million short of funding Phase 1, and would need to accelerate the beginning of construction date to complete phase 1 by 2012.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Comment Date: 7/31/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Walt Elliott

Organization: Kingston FAC

Comment:

The Kingston Ferry Advisory Committee gives it's strongest possible endorsement to the comments made by the Kingston Regional Coordinating Council concerning the WSF Long Range Strategic Plan. These comments reflect the needs of the Kingston-Edmonds ferry ridership and we believe that the appropriate action to address them should be taken before issuing the final plan.



Comment Date: 5/26/2006
Contact Type: Email and Letter

Name: Walt Elliott
Organization: Kingston FAC

Comment:

The Kingston Ferry Advisory Committee has reviewed and discussed with the Kingston community your "Washington State Ferries' Draft Long-Range Strategic Plan 2006-2030". Overall, the Kingston community enthusiastically supports the addition of ferries to the route as described in the Plan. However, we are seriously concerned about the impact of ferry traffic congestion in Kingston. The community also feels strongly that fares increases are excessive, that improvement is needed in schedule coordination between WSF and county transportation systems, and that close collaboration between WSF and Kitsap Transit will be vital to successful passenger-only ferry service in Kingston.

The Kingston Ferry Advisory Committee wants to thank you and your staff for preparing this Plan and presenting it the community in Kingston. We strongly request that WSF consider the issues discussed in the attachment to this letter and include, as appropriate, the recommendations made as you finalizes this Plan. We also request that these issues be addressed to our community by representatives from, WSF and WSDOT at the next scheduled WSF Kingston Public Meeting in September.

Walter Elliott

Chairman, Kingston Ferry Advisory Committee

May 26,2006

Kingston Ferry Advisory Committee Concerns, Comments, and Recommendations to
Washington State Ferries Draft Long-Range Strategic Plan 2006-2030 dated April 2006

Traffic Impact Concerns

Background:

At the Kingston terminal, ferry traffic divides our downtown by passing directly through its center. Kingston also has the highest vehicular traffic of all the WSF routes. As a consequence, during peak traffic times we experience blocked intersections, back- ups, and blockage of SR 104 side streets, pedestrian safety concerns and the overflow of holding lane traffic. This traffic also inhibits access to Kingston's Community Center/Library/Senior Center building. We believe these conditions will worsen with the traffic growth projected by the Plan and with addition of boats to the run. These traffic impacts must be addressed at both the state and community levels. The Kingston community has been involved in a long-term process to plan and re-design Kingston's downtown area. Kingston needs WSF and WSFDOT to collaborate with the community in assessing and addressing current traffic concerns and the off-route impacts that the traffic from three- and four-boat service will cause.



Requested Actions:

The Plan should state that near-term traffic control measures are needed in Kingston and that future highway and holding-area improvements will be needed to provide the needed traffic management and handling capacity. We urge that the Plan, or an appendix to the Plan, include activity to initiate two specific actions as follows:

An intensive Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) encompassing the core Kingston community. A TIA coupled with context sensitive design solutions to mitigate the impact of traffic surges and add traffic holding capacity should be a collaborative effort between WSF, WSDOT, Kitsap County, and the Kingston community.

A State Route 104 Route Development Plan for that portion of SR 104 between Streible's Corner (the SR 307/104 intersection) and Kingston. This process should include participation by WSDOT, SF, Kitsap County, Kitsap Transit, the tribes and community stakeholders.

Ferry Traffic Estimate Concerns

Background:

The Plan benchmarks WSF level of service performance to traffic conditions during the Wednesday afternoon commute in the month of May and makes future projections based on expected county growth. Using Wednesday afternoons in May does not represent the serious service conditions in Kingston. High ferry traffic conditions in Kingston occur Thursday through Monday in the summer months. We also are concerned that traffic growth Kingston will likely be greater than Kitsap County growth as a whole. This is, in part, due to the shift of traffic from the Bainbridge route to the Kingston route, as called for in the Plan, and in part due to the growth in Kingston ferry traffic from Jefferson and Clallam Counties.

Requested Action:

The Plan should either include level of service projections for the period of concern or describe how the estimates in the Plan have taken the factors discussed above into account.

Fares

Background:

Riders of the Kingston/Edmonds ferry route know that, under the current Plan for fare recovery, they bear a disproportionate burden of public transportation costs. Fares collected on the Kingston run exceed the costs. Users of the state's highways and bridges elsewhere pay no additional cost. Other public transit in Washington state have public subsidy with fare recovery rates far below that of the ferry system. State fuel taxes paid by ferry rider fares are not being returned to the ferry system. Even as an 80% recovery rate is reached the Plan continues to increase fare recovery to over 100%.

Recommendation:

The Kingston FAC believes that recovery rates should be capped at 80% with the fuel tax being



returned to the ferry system.

Coordination with other Public Transit Systems:

Background:

The Long-Range Plan places a heavy emphasis on increased foot passenger traffic that will connect with other public transportation systems. For this to be achievable the Kingston Ferry Advisory Committee believes that a major effort is needed to improve the coordination of schedules between WSF, Kitsap Transit, Community Transit, Metro Transit and Sound Transit.

Recommendation:

A process to coordinate passenger traffic growth with other transit agencies should be clearly be defined in the Plan. This process should include input and participation from the affected ferry commuters.

Passenger-Only Ferry Service

Background:

The Plan assumes that passenger-only ferry service from Kingston to Seattle will carry a significant portion of future cross-Sound passengers. While it states that WSF will collaborate with the operators of this service, the nature of this collaboration is not described.

Recommendation:

At a minimum, the Plan should address usage of the Colman Dock by the Passenger Only Ferry operators.

Comment Date: 6/5/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Walt Elliott

Organization: Kingston FAC

Comment:

I noticed there were no comments provided from the Kingston meeting in your enclosure. Here's a precis from the notes that I took at the meeting:

1. The plan does not address community concerns over term traffic congestion and impact issues. This is both a long term problem and a problem that exists now which is not being addressed.
2. WSF and WSDOT should both come to the next public meeting and jointly address traffic issues with the community.
3. Ferry fares are inequitable in comparison to other public transportation systems i.e. roads,



busses, trains.

4. With a bridge fare coming on line Kitsap residents feel trapped into paying to get off of the peninsula.
5. Better coordination is needed in matching up ferry schedules, bus, and train schedules. A group who just got off the Sounder train said that running for the ferry was the norm. Another group mentioned that some commuter boats were not covered by Kitsap Transit busses.
6. The ridership is looking forward towards a integrated, seamless ticketing system for ferries, trains and busses.
7. WSF should look into technology oriented solutions to reduce costs and improve service. e.g. more fuel efficient boats, extended routes.
8. The community believes that foot ferry service to Seattle will be a major solution to long term growth and ferry needs in Kitsap County. WSF support in this is strongly desired by the community.
9. WSF should look into reviving the Suquamish terminal to relieve the pressure on Bainbridge Island and Kingston terminals.
10. The money WSF pays in state fuel taxes should be returned to WSF instead of being put into other funds.

Comment Date: 4/4/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Iklil Gregg Nye

Organization:

Comment:

I was just reading the information regarding the future plans for the ferry system. Under the Seattle-Bremerton route, I don't know if it's a typo, but it states "WSF plans to increase the Seattle-Bainbridge route to three vessels by the year 2015." A new boat for Bainbridge won't really help Bremerton out at all. It takes 45 minutes to an hour to drive from Bainbridge to Bremerton and for that one might as well drive around through Tacoma. I think increasing the route times to Bremerton could be beneficial. I think the best idea to resolve the problem would be to make a tunnel or bridge from Bainbridge to Bremerton and then route all of the ferry traffic through Bainbridge and get rid of the Bremerton car ferry all together. I know you'll probably laugh at my suggestion, but it makes more sense than any of the other ideas.

The Olympic peninsula is only growing. It could be a gold mine of tourism and so could the ferries if everyone works together!

Thanks for listening (or a good laugh),



Comment Date: 5/2/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Virginia Metcalf

Organization:

Comment:

Wrong direction! We need a bold plan to move people, vehicles and equipment across the sound. Ferries are necessary, but use bridge where more feasible. 75 ferries per day from Vashon Island at 2/3rd the cost of other fares makes no sense for 11k residents.

Ferries, bridges and highways serve same purpose. Its to suit the terrain available, be fair on your costs to all residents on fares.

Coleman terminal is bad design. It needs better traffic flow engineering! Solve more traffic problems than you create. Consider moving trucks on slack times to relieve highway congestion.

Comment Date: 5/2/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: R. Metcalf

Organization:

Comment:

Not dynamic enough! Let's exercise some heavy planning to move people and equipment. Consider the Navy Bases as important anchors. Fauntleroy is a poor location for a terminal. Direct traffic to easy move to freeways, and where they want to go. The Coleman Dock is a catastrophe! Poor design; worst we know of.

Revamp Vashon Island runs! 75/day departures for est. 11k residents is a waste! A bridge could really save money! Vashon fare rates are unfair too compared to other runs.

Yes, consider 3 fast B.C. Catamrans berthed in N. Van. B.C. at WA, Marine-Inc.. If we are trying to perpetuate our ferry system maintain your course, even Prince Edward Island replaced their Ferry with a 35 mile long bridge. Face up to "facts of life!"



Comment Date: 4/25/2006

Contact Type: Phone

Name: Dave Crawford

Organization:

Comment:

-WSF does not run a good business and is not clear about revenue projections expected from the Colman Dock redevelopment. How much revenue does WSF really expect to get?

-WSF should sell the rights to the Colman Dock property outright and not try to play developer.

-Riding the ferries is often a waste of time because of all the time spent waiting in line.

-There is no money in the system and in tax payers' pockets to pay for all these extras (development). Concentrate on upgrading the vessels and replacing old vessels such as the Steel Electrics.

-Put additional money towards beefing up security at the ferry terminals and lifesaving equipment on the vessels.

Comment Date: 7/7/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Stephen Ruhl

Organization:

Comment:

I think your hope that you are going to divert vehicle traffic to Bremerton and Kingston away from Bainbridge is a pipe dream.

You completely ignore your maintenance. The additional larger vessels will require more room and there is no provision in the LRP for the BI Maintenance facility.

Comment Date: 4/6/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Julie Geer

Organization:

Comment:

That's stupid. Why would they increase runs to a town that has little traffic as it is and



Bainbridge Island's is increasing?

Comment Date: 4/4/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Elisha Kibbe

Organization:

Comment:

In the email below it mentions the Bainbridge route increasing under the Seattle-Bremerton run. Is the Seattle-Bremerton route increasing to 3 vessels?

Comment Date: 4/5/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Sally Banfill

Organization:

Comment:

In your long range plan email it said:
Seattle-Bremerton

WSF plans to increase the Seattle-Bainbridge route to three vessels by the year 2015.

I am hoping this is a misprint and that you plan to increase the Seattle-BREMERTON route to 3 vessels.

Comment Date: 4/4/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Glenn Morton

Organization:

Comment:

“Central Sound
Seattle-Bremerton

WSF plans to increase the Seattle-Bainbridge route to three vessels by the year 2015. “

Did you really mean Seattle-Bremerton here and not Seattle-Bainbridge?



Comment Date: 4/4/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Effie Moody

Organization:

Comment:

Central Sound

Seattle-Bremerton

WSF plans to increase the Seattle-Bainbridge route to three vessels by the year 2015.

was this a typo...did you mean...Seattle-Bainbridge or Seattle-Bremerton???

Comment Date: 4/8/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Anna Daniels

Organization:

Comment:

Seattle-Bainbridge Island needs three boats before Seattle-Bremerton. Simply increasing passenger capacity on existing Bainbridge vessels will create longer load times, and thus less frequent service.

n the late 1990's, Bainbridge was promised three-boat service. With projected increases in vehicles and passengers, why is this change taking so long? Please add three boat service to Bainbridge Island, as soon as possible.

Comment Date: 4/4/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Michael Young

Organization:

Comment:

Typical treatment of Bremerton Riders...

Central Sound



Seattle-Bremerton

WSF plans to increase the Seattle-Bainbridge route to three vessels by the year 2015.

Don't they already have enough runs in Bainbridge? What about Bremerton? I hope this was a typo.

Comment Date: 4/20/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Anonymous

Organization:

Comment:

Just shortly after World War II should have used left over bombs to have deepen and widen Rich Passage before bulkheads and homes and people complaining about losing their beaches to tides and currents. Super ferry double-deckers are fun. People can walk around the top decks.

Comment Date: 4/20/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Anonymous

Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

Why don't you think about a bridge(s) instead of ferries???

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

The rights-of-way are already in the state's possession!

3. Do you have other comments?

Think outside the ferry!



Comment Date: 4/20/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Guy Frindell

Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

Bremerton needs better service. In 1975 there was virtually hourly service with the Yakima and Hyak. The increases in service to various routes is pretty far out.

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

The idea of collecting 80 percent of the costs is outrageous! It will cause people to drive around.

Comment Date: 4/20/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Anonymous

Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

Bremerton-Seattle run-should get the third boat as soon as possible.

Reduce the 80 percent fare box recovery goal.

Give Pier 50 to passenger ferries/Kitsap Transit.

Better intermodality is required at Colman Dock.

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

Reduce the 80 percent fare box recovery goal. This is supposed to be a marine highway.

3. Do you have other comments?

Please move the 10:50 p.m. boat from Seattle to Bremerton to 10:45 p.m. or publicly announce that it would leave 15 minutes after end of Mariners games.



Comment Date: 4/20/2006
Contact Type: Form

Name: Matt Ryan
Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

Put third boat on Bremerton as early as possible-If you can't handle three boats at Winslow-move dock to Port Blakely and bridge to Manette. I believe that there will not be enough capacity for what the real capacity will be.

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

Vet population projection history with actual census figures-I found in the 1990's the state had a history of low balling.

3. Do you have other comments?

Good luck Ray. Use air rights by Colman Dock in conjunction with Alaskan Way re-building project.

Comment Date: 4/20/2006
Contact Type: Form

Name: Anonymous
Organization:

Comment:

Letting passengers out at the street to walk over to the terminal. How about handicapped? Picking up passengers-where? There are three little parking places below the hotel-not adequate-again not convenient for handicapped. Couldn't we allow drop-offs and pick-ups for private cars as long as we do not stay after drop-offs?



Comment Date: 4/4/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Leslie Ring
Organization:

Comment:

I am a regular commuter on the Bremerton to Seattle ferry runs. I would just like to know when we will see an end to ferry fare increases. This seems to be an ongoing concern among all commuters and there seems to be no end in sight. What exactly are we paying for since we already ride on the oldest ferries in the WSF system and we are not seeing any changes to the interior of the vessels or a cut in ferry staff? Please explain.....

Comment Date: 4/4/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Jay Douglas
Organization:

Comment:

Bring back the Bremerton passenger only ferry / ferry routes. I see no consideration in this capacity.

Comment Date: 4/20/2006
Contact Type: Form

Name: Anonymous
Organization:

Comment:

I hope there will be more thought given about dropping off and picking up passengers. There has been no thought of safety of convenience for persons parking and waiting.



Comment Date: 4/28/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Svenn & Elaine Lovlie

Organization:

Comment:

We have a question WHY when you get a printed riders slip with car & driver from the booth in SEATTLE and you say going to Bremerton it is printed Bainbridge Island and you confront the ticket taker and the remarks is: does not make any difference. When you read about the difference in ridership it points out Bremerton is low. Why, because Seattle prints most of the time Bainbridge Island with car and driver. We say it does make a difference with the count. Please Explain, thank you.

Comment Date: 4/26/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Anonymous

Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

Good effort. Keep going!

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

Capitalize on Washington State's brains, money and industry to pioneer new technology and systems that can be sold/deployed globally as well as here in Puget Sound.

Comment Date: 4/4/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Cindy Morton

Organization:

Comment:

I am a daily commuter, taking a Kingston-Bainbridge bus, and usually take the 7:05 am Bainbridge and 4:40 pm Seattle ferries.



First, I hope that the passenger only ferry service will return to Kingston as soon as possible. I am a single mom of 2 teens, and I work full-time in downtown Seattle and live close to the Kingston ferry terminal. Adequate, affordable transportation would reduce the stress that the long commutes take and give me more time at home.

Second, I was wondering why the commuter buses at Bainbridge have to wait until the ferry has unloaded before leaving? I don't understand why vanpool vehicles get priority service, while many, many more bus riders (who reduce the vehicle traffic the most) have to wait...we should have someone to halt foot and car traffic to allow buses a quick and smooth exit from the bus loading area. (Most exiting cars and foot traffic pay no heed to buses trying to exit....)

Comment Date: 5/15/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Louis Foritano

Organization:

Comment:

Modest but positive. Too little too late. Clearly no meaningful, tangible evidence ferry planning integrated with traffic, road and local bus infrastructure. Political stupidity to have multiple, disintegrated carriers for cars and passengers. No sense that ferries seen as part of overall state transportation and only offering planning.

We-- state, county, residents-- need to spend/pay whatever is required to set this up right for long term in face of obvious major growth and development in the Peninsula; coupled with the complete lack of any current, integrated national energy/transportation planning.

Where is the ongoing Community Advisory Committee?

Comment Date: 4/5/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Stephen Lundgren

Organization:

Comment:

Gosh, I was hoping that the Seattle-Port Blakely or Seattle-Eagledale route might be revived with a third boat on the run. Here's some serious comments, which I would appreciate being included as part of the comments on this process:

If this is truly a Long Range Plan, how about a Central Kitsap to Ballard passenger route? The street end on Seaview Avenue is still available and we do have a four lane highway from Aurora thru Ballard where someday there should be a Sounder Commuter Rail Line Station,



which was "designed" by city planners (but is yet unfunded) with an awareness of the legally required availability of the Shilshole Bay Marina to accommodate passenger ferry service (it's in the agreement to transfer the land which was entrusted by the State of Washington to the City of Seattle and specified when the land was transferred to the Port of Seattle. It's in the ordinances as one of the four required uses for SBM.

I hope at the least that there is an awareness of the Edmonds Sounder station as part of a truly long range cross-sound transportation plan, although that does not provide any transportation access solutions for the North Seattle subarea.

Comment Date: 4/17/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: David Berry

Organization:

Comment:

It seems very apparent that the logistics of access and egress to the downtown ferry terminal and to the Bainbridge terminal dictate that in the long term, the primary terminals to connect the Olympic Peninsula to the east side of Puget Sound should be the Kingston, Edmonds run.

Freeway access to the Seattle terminal is impracticable. Expanding HWY 305 on Bainbridge and the Agate Pass Bridge as well as developing high speed passage through Poulsbo is also impracticable.

Highway access from I-5 to just south of the Port of Edmonds already exists. The area between to two one way streets in Kinston can be acquired relatively inexpensively providing adequate space for a major terminal.

The existing HWY 3 can be extended over the Port Gamble ridge to connect with Bond road directly to Kingston. This route would efficiently tie I-5 to HWY 3 providing freeway access over the Hood Canal Bridge to the Olympic Peninsula, HWY 3 to Poulsbo, Silverdale and Bremerton as well as reasonably good access to Suquamish and Bainbridge.

It is my recommendation that Bainbridge be de-emphasized as the major terminal to the west side of Puget Sound and that long term emphasis be on developing the Kingston, Edmonds run.



Comment Date: 5/2/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: David Kutz

Organization:

Comment:

I am speaking as a long time resident of Kingston and a commercial property/building owner in the downtown business core of Kingston.

I like the increase of boats and services planned, but something needs to be done with the gridlock in the traffic pattern caused by the off loading ferries. Right now each time a ferry arrives, the main traffic pattern for the community is choked up to a virtual standstill for several minutes. The traffic backup goes all the way to George's Corner sometimes (2-3 miles out).

To increase the frequency and amount of cars from off-loading ferries without a better traffic pattern, or by-pass, is not a workable solution. More ferries will mean more traffic and a constant state of congestion. Instead of having a huge traffic jam 2 times in an hour, we'll have it constantly all day long, and we won't be able to move or flow locally.

I would rather see the ferry terminal move out of Kingston (like the Edmond's plan) than increase the frequency of ferry traffic problems in Kingston.

A by-pass or tunnel or some kind of method to get the traffic away from the ferry terminal without impeding the local traffic should be considered WAY BEFORE you start thinking of putting on more boats and increasing the amount of boats. THIS IS IMPERATIVE.

At the Apr. 26 Kingston meeting you stated that the fare box pays for 75% of the operating budget which is much higher than the normal percentage of transportation authority, such as buses or rail. But you still have plans to increase the fares.

I suggest the ferries be in line with other transit authorities and not hit its riders so hard with fares and fare increases. Why are ferry riders singled out over other public transportation systems and have to pay a much bigger percentage?

I realize this would involve more work for WSF to secure funding sources for its operations. WSF needs to do a much better job lobbying for more funding. If other transportation agencies can operate with less fare box subsidy, than so should the WSF.

Your lobbying team and legislative budget planners need to work harder to secure state transportation funds for ferry operations, and fight for our fair share. It can't just be left up to a few local Senators and Representatives to try to bargain for. They have too many issues on the table to give total focus to ferry travel. Management and planners need to be actively involved in the legislative funding process and budget process. WSF should DEMAND their fare share of funding and have as much say as the people fighting for roads, bridges, buses and rail. Better lobbying for these funds is clearly needed. You can't just blame the Legislature for being inattentive or unimaginative.

We want the Port of Kingston to maintain ownership of the Kingston terminal. Local control and



opportunities for our waterfront should be left to our own jurisdiction. We can serve it better.

Re: Kingston Ferry Traffic again, the INCOMING traffic.

The vehicle holding pattern for Kingston is currently sub-standard. Cars are held on the shoulder of Highway 104, sometimes an hour or so. This is a very unsafe traffic situation not to mention the almost in-humane conditions for the waiting car drivers and passengers. There is no place for people to stretch their legs or use the restrooms. I have heard reports of people going to the bathroom in people's yards and other trespassing acts because of no facilities being provided for waiting cars on the highway.

Two things that could be done to alleviate this problem and actually make waiting for a ferry in Kingston a nice experience:

a) the State owns various properties around Kingston. I understand you own a property by Lindvog Road that could be developed into a ferry holding parking lot. This should be done immediately before some little kid from a car waiting on the highway is killed by through traffic. The new holding area parking lot could still be left partially wooded (fringe) and contain restrooms, vending and other amenities for travelers. The state also owns a parking lot on the corner of E 1st and Iowa St, which could hold several cars. On Sundays, this lot is empty. Sunday is the day most of the incoming traffic holding problems occur.

B). People should be able to get in line for the ferry or take a number and then be free to move about the community unhurried if they choose. Why do they have to be relegated to a long line? At Disneyland, for example, they have a system called "Fast Pass" for their attractions to avoid long lines. You go to a certain checkpoint and take a ticket. The ticket tells you to come back to the holding area next to the attraction at a certain time frame and you wait briefly for an immediate showing. It works very smooth and WSF could employ the same concept in Kingston.

You now have the State personnel issuing ferry line tickets already to get them shuffled from Lindvog Road to the lower terminal parking lot on the waterfront. Simply give the people in line a ticket, which tells them to show up at the lower terminal at a certain time frame. They could be free to either stay in the new holding area uptown until their time to enter the lower lot, or to move about town and go the lower lot at their appointed time. Sure there would be some logistics to work out, but this is possible if you are willing to work on it. You already have a similar system like this in Friday Harbor on a smaller scale, so it could be done in Kingston too.

Thanks for hearing my concerns and recommendations.

Sincerely,

David Kutz, speaking as a long time resident of Kingston and a commercial property/building owner in the downtown business core of Kingston.



Comment Date: 4/5/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Karna McKinney

Organization:

Comment:

I am concerned that I do not see plans for another boat for the Bainbridge run, particularly with the building boom going on on the island. Usually, I walk on the Bainbridge ferry, then meet my van pool at Colman dock when it arrives from Bremerton. There are not enough people at or close my workplace to support a full van from Bainbridge. My normal commute is about 4 hours per day. Were I to take the bus, I would need to take an earlier ferry or ride a later one home, which would make my commute almost 5 hours a day. But the biggest waste of time is the hours and hours spent waiting because of overloaded ferries when I must have a car in Seattle for medical appointments, errands, or working late. As you must know, it is especially bad on Fridays and any afternoon in the summer, when I can pretty much count on 5 to 5.75 hours of commuting. (I live on Bainbridge and commute to Sand Point.) Before the Tim Iman initiative, Bainbridge did have a third boat for a short time. I do not see how just adding more seats on the already very crowded Bainbridge commuter boats will address the future needs or the long wait times on the dock when a person has no choice but to drive.

Comment Date: 4/5/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Bob Jenness

Organization:

Comment:

I look forward to the public meeting on the 13th on BI. The volume and capacity issues seem to be on the BI/Sea run, especially for cars, not Bremerton. The Bi run handles traffic from Silverdale to Kingston and beyond. While WSF and BI have had issues in the past, it is not in anyone's best interest for WSF to enact punitive measures toward the BI run.

Comment Date: 4/17/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Mary Ann Proctor

Organization:

Comment:

First let's talk long range plan – I confess I didn't read the whole meeting package. Why? After page two and three I concluded the goal of the draft was to define a level of service that was slight above failure mode. For instance – future growth tied to minimum level of service.



Average peak time boat-wait is 100 minutes. On page three I liked the colored pictures but without labels how can I interpret the options?

Also, as much as I wanted to like the commissioner of Transportation, Bob – please excuse me I don't remember his last name - I found his presentation too extreme to respond to. The zero minute wait that he suggested felt presumptive – it is the logic of someone who gets into his car and goes – I ride the bus, I ride the ferry and I was offended. To offer contrast - as you engineer consultant was about to leave he asked us when the next ferry was – my husband gave him Bainbridge Talk, “the next ferry is the next ferry.”

To give a cooking analogy Commissioner Bob's remarks - both about wait time and pricing being nothing but politics - was reduced like the sticky residue of a reduced sauce that has potential but is indigestible unless you add body to it. I do not attend public meetings because I hate extreme views – I was shocked that a public official in the know would give me sticky-in-your-face; I'm not going to dialogue, but talk-at-you presentation. I wanted something digestible...

Riding the ferry is a mind set. The ferry system is about to lose my good will, and my feelings are shared by others.

To give examples – I counted my unused car tickets. Hum – I donated fifty bucks to the ferry system. How could this happen – we used to take our car into Seattle on weekends. Now it costs too much, so we- me and my husband- think let's not, only we forget and buy our tickets by the book. We live here – we should get a discount – after Tim Eyman- it's we who pay. This weekend we decided to no longer buying a whole lot of nothing and subsidizes the ferry with our car. Could this impact your thinking - or will just keeping going in a straight line to failure mode?

Another example –I ride Metro and since the new remodel took down the metro system wide bus map that was on the wall – Yes, there is a regional map that a person in a car might like to see, but not a bus rider & the people in the terminal are not the ones downstairs riding in their cars. Three times I asked for the return of a wall mounted bus map – yet, I was told oh, it's the ferry system and they never listen to their employees you have to contact them directly. What going on? Why are your workers so alienated?

Is one reason why the long range meeting diverted into other issues because the ferry system is no longer permeable?

Lastly – Electronic ticketing is repulsive, it's moving the meat. Have you considered the security advantage of having a holding area? Bainbridge commuting ferry-riding community eye-each-other as we wait - we are smart; if someone looks weird we will tell you. That is unless the ferry service planning beyond comfort density, reasonable wait, good will, makes everything so impersonal – only armed guards are there – no friendly ticket takers, no smiling wishing us good morning Bill's – get the picture... its a nightmare.

Can you understand what you are losing in your rush towards planning failure mode into the ferry service?

Lastly Ferries are also about trust and safety. I trust the community I ride with. Making it impersonal you make it unsafe. The employees, the commuters, the fifteen minute survival time in Puget Sound requires critical thinking and amazing good will that goes beyond transportation



planning, budget crunching or long ranging planning. Think about it - having enough life boats and not depending on the second ferry in an emergency to be available to pick people up goes a long way to showing you are serious about planning success not failure.

Comment Date: 4/4/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Julie Geer

Organization:

Comment:

Are you going to add more runs (or another boat?) to the Bainbridge Island route? It'd be nice to have boats every half hour instead of every 45 minutes...

Comment Date: 4/5/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Kirk Robinson

Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

Other than seating capacity increases, nothing was really proposed for Seattle/Bainbridge. But you could address ways to increase alternative forms of transportation such as bicycles/access/egress issues at terminals, bicycle waiting areas at terminals, bicycle stowage on boats (racks), and fare incentives (no surcharge or "pass" charges).

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

I believe there will be a significant growth in tele-commuting, affecting ferry use patterns and demand. I didn't see this addressed in the assumptions.

Fares stabilizing?-Based on what I have observed on the TPC, I doubt that will happen-the pressure for 80 percent farebox recovery will likely continue to drive fares higher at a faster rate-(~5%) probably resulting in much lower increases in ferry demand.

3. Do you have other comments?

Other than saying "walk-on" passenger travel will increase, the plan really says nothing about promoting and enhancing alternative forms of transportation (pedestrians, bicycles, van pools, car pools). Creating incentives here may delay need for additional boats on vans (driven by auto projections). Use of financial incentives, addressing access/egress issues could result in



fewer single occupancy vehicles, thus reducing wait times and when LOS standards are met.

Colman Dock issues. WSF/City/Port should think outside the box. There have been several proposals published regarding redevelopment of the area west of the two stadiums...how about putting the auto ferry dock there-near where cruise ships now dock. This would provide a greater holding area, better inter-modal possibilities, easier access to I-90, I-5 and keep cars out of the downtown grid that don't need to be there. Colman Dock could be a passenger ferry hub.

How about an Edmonds-Pt. Townsend (tourist) route (as in 1979). Could relieve some of the Kingston/Bainbridge traffic.

Comment Date: 4/4/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Amy Van Fossen

Organization:

Comment:

I've recently started commuting to downtown Seattle from Indianola via Kitsap Transit and the Bainbridge ferry.

My observation: The Bainbridge ferry is very crowded, especially the 8 am and 4:40p Seattle to Bainbridge runs, so the draft's proposal to increase capacity seems like a reasonable one, but I think it is not a solution that will solve this problem in the long run.

My recommendation: The ideal situation would be to have a Kingston to Seattle route, because many of us who ride the Bainbridge ferry are from areas closer to Kingston (i.e. Suquamish, Hansville, Indianola, etc). This possibility would decrease the ridership of the Bainbridge run (and improve island traffic problems). I understand that WSF passenger only service is not possible, but maybe that new boat you plan to put on the Kingston run could go to Seattle? (In other words, some runs go to Kingston, some to Seattle)

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Comment Date: 5/5/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: John Hural

Organization:

Comment:

My two cents....to whom it may concern.



I am sorry I missed the town meetings regarding the future of the ferry system, I was hoping to attend. If this issue was discussed already, I am sorry and I would appreciate an update.

It seems late departure problem of the 6:20 PM sailing from Seattle should be fairly simple to resolve. The M-F 6:20PM has been my usual commuter boat for the past 6 years, and I am pretty sure it has not left on time once in the past year and a half (well maybe a couple of times at best). However, the schedule is usually back on track by the 7:20 PM sailing. Last summer these delays "due to heavy traffic" were every day for the 6:20 PM sailing. That does not mean that it is abnormally "heavy traffic", it means the sailing schedule is not planned properly for current level of traffic.

So it seems pretty obvious that the need for a 1 hour gap is following the 5:30 sailing, rather than between 6:20 and 7:20. Thus, all the ferry system would have to do is change the official departure time of the 6:20 to 6:30 (it's usual departure time anyway) and the problem is solved.

That would relieve a lot of stress for the captain who always has to be late, and it would be MUCH better for those of us who rush down to the terminal every day for the 6:20 and have to wait around because the boat is late. It would work much better for us to know that we can always come down for a 6:30 boat without risking missing the boat because it was only 8 minutes late instead of 10 that day.

Any thoughts or plans for this remedying this?

Comment Date: 4/13/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Anonymous

Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

So far, it doesn't address transit other than the conventional bus. Should plan for possible light rail, bus rapid transit and Mag Lev.

Particularly for pedestrians (and notably there with movement limitations), the route into Winslow needs to be much more direct, intuitive and efficient. Should have much less dip and jog to get into Town & Country area in Winslow. This would also make reverse commute tourism better and add to fare box revenues.

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

Need to articulate level of service for bike, ped and transit in addition to LOS for vehicles.

Need to model demand for bike/ped-looking more closely at bike and pedestrian travel sheds.

Should address opportunity for reverse commute fares with greater attention to tourism.



Comment Date: 4/13/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Bill Kreger

Organization:

Comment:

I live in Eagle Harbor Condominiums. We (a lot of residents) have asked on numerous occasions that WSF take some simple measures to reduce noise, light pollution and fumes reaching EHC. Slats in the chain link fences could do a great deal to improve our quality of life.

Comment Date: 4/4/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Marcy Salo

Organization:

Comment:

As a ferry commuter for the past 18 years, I would just like to encourage WSF to work on increasing service as they continue to increase fares. Over the past five years especially, I have noticed a particular downward turn in the level of customer service amongst WSF workers – not to mention timeliness.

As we approach summertime, I am bracing myself for daily late arrivals on the return to Bainbridge on the 4:40 boats. As summer tourists arrive in Seattle, the clock by which the ferries sale goes out the window apparently. Not only do they insist on holding people in a pen like animals as the temperatures skyrocket, but then they insist upon holding the boats to catch every last tourist, showing little to no respect for the daily commuter – those of us who are expected to help in making WSF self-supporting, financially.

I don't hold out much hope that any of these comments will be taken to heart, but I guess I felt compelled to make them anyway. I long for the day when I, too, can retire from the ferries.



Comment Date: 7/20/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Merrill Robison

Organization:

Comment:

Thank you for extending comments to the DRAFT Washington State Ferry's Strategic 2030 Long Range Plan. I have been in 3 audiences, including the first presentation to the Transportation Commission, that Ray Deardorf has given his overview of the plan. I think the DRAFT is a very good start. I question the lack of concerns of traffic impact on the State roads leading to and from the terminals. Also there is no mention anywhere in the plan for future Maintenance Facilities. How about possible future runs like Kinston to Seattle?

Now the work begins with asking the Draft computer model "What if Questions". These "What if Questions" should test some of the basic assumptions plus some of the unstated assumptions that follow. The underlined assumptions below are what should be tested.

STATED ASSUMPTIONS

Car and driver future growth
Walkon passenger future growth
Base "level of service"
80% fare box revenue goal
No passenger only after 7/01/07
Size and character of new boats
Vessel purchase timing
Kitsap future population vs PSRCC
Excess operating revenue to capital
No total system capital projections
Fare appreciation schedule

UNSTATED ASSUMPTIONS:

Impact of work at home with high speed broadband or wireless
Capital Leases expense treated as operating expense
Impact of new Narrows bridge
Impact of Poulsbo's Olhava development
No changes or additions of port and terminals additions
Eagle Harbor harbor restrictions including possible passenger only boats
How was the size of the new boats determined?
Pricing elasticity impact on usage

MAJOR DRAFT PLAN SHORTCOMINGS:

No mention of the needs of a maintenance facility
No consideration of Hiway 3 or 305 traffic
No consideration of needs of Kitsap Transit



Central Puget sound run accounting vs Central Sound System-B.I., Bremerton, Kingston
Total system capital and possible sources

I will be happy to help you draft the "What If " questions to the above underlined assumptions to test the model. I think the most important "what If" might be moving the 3rd boat to Bremerton from 2015 to 2007. And its impact on B.I. Runs and hiway 3/305 issues. The next most important "What if" might be a car ferry from Kingston to Seattle, a new run.

Comment Date: 4/26/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Sonny Woodward

Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

I think that we need them. I'm glad the WSF is reaching out to the commuter for comment.

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

I'm concerned about shoreside service, i.e. parking lots/road expansion, ect. We need more and better roads in north Kitsap and Jefferson County.

3. Do you have other comments?

We need passenger ferries to Kingston/Bremerton, Southworth and Vashon-they should be subsidized and privately run and the car ferries run by DOT.

Comment Date: 4/4/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Mark Moshay

Organization:

Comment:

Suggestion: Could we please have a dedicated booth during peak hours for commuters. 6-8am and 3-5 pm M-F.

I've asked before and told it wasn't "feasible" I disagree.

By having one booth for pre-ticketed vehicles only, it would encourage people to buy tickets in advance, and also allow those of us who commute each day, to avoid having to sit for long



periods while people pass forward credit cards, cash, etc. and slow down the line.

If signs were posted upstream in the line saying "Right hand booth for pre-ticketed passengers only" it would be helpful.

I see too that the grand plan for having the electronic cards did not happen in November of 2005 as was planned. I'm told that's still in the works. However, it seems to me that unless ALL cars are required to prepay, it will not change the long wait time as individuals approach the booths with no ticket or prepaid card.

Comment Date: 4/26/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Anonymous

Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

Adding passenger only service between Seattle and Kingston is a step in the right direction.

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

Increasing vehicle service without improving the roads will not work.

Comment Date: 4/6/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Lyn Chagaris-Taylor

Organization:

Comment:

As a Kingston resident I couldn't help but notice the Seattle/Kingston foot ferry possibly starting by 2030????? We need one now. There are so many homes being built and if the marketing were done well you would find that there are 100's of us that would use that foot ferry. The marketing and running of the Aqua Express was done so poorly AND it was expensive compared to the state run ferries. If we had a state run foot ferry you would have a much better ridership. If you were to send a survey out to all of the Hansville and Kingston residence I bet you would get a HUGE response. 2030 just does not sound right to me.



Comment Date: 5/10/2006
Contact Type: Form

Name: Anonymous
Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

See below. The problems of the Kitsap travel shed aren't solved by the Long-Range Strategic Plan.

Vessels—an Australian outfit has developed aluminum ferries that are smaller (130ish cars) but faster. They've been used on the Atlantic Coast and Great Lakes because the ferries are best on long runs. Could that technology have any application on Puget Sound?

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

Page 66 of the Plan raises the question of should the WSF consider expanding by "building new terminals in conjunction with new routes" after 2030. Yes, but don't wait until after 2030. Don't do anything that fixes Olympic Peninsula recreational traffic across the Kitsap Peninsula and Hood Canal Bridge. Both are bottlenecks now and will only get much worse by 2030. Diverting recreational traffic from the Bainbridge/Seattle run to Edmonds/Kingston is only a short-term band-aid. It doesn't solve Bainbridge's problem and aggravates Edmonds.

Comment Date: 4/26/2006
Contact Type: Form

Name: Kathryn Thompson
Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

Passenger only service to both Kingston and Seattle are extremely important.

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

Farebox rates that meet or exceed operating costs is onerous and WRONG. The rest of the users of the state highway system do not shoulder this cost in addition to their taxes. Why expect this HUGE cost from Kitsap County citizens who have very few options. Please reconsider and charge less for ferry service, not more.

3. Do you have other comments?



The unions that represent the ferry workers have driven the operating cost to an unreasonably high level. Public/private cooperation should not be bound by the unions and should achieve more efficiency and economy.

Comment Date: 4/26/2006
Contact Type: Form

Name: Pete DeBoer
Organization:

Comment:

If ridership increases at the predicted rates, what does WSDOT have in mind for highway spacing?

Comment Date: 4/26/2006
Contact Type: Form

Name: Hugh Starks
Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

I understand the increased demand, but do not understand the logic to cover all ferry expenses with rider fares. WSF needs to seek funding from the general WSDOT transportation fund!

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

The farebox recovery idea is flawed! You cannot expect rider fares to make up the subsidy difference due to I-695.



Comment Date: 4/26/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Betsy Cooper

Organization:

Comment:

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

The North Kitsap population assumptions were artificially enlarged to accommodate a specific developer/sub area planning modification. So it should not be the basis for your projections. A more average 2-3 percent, like the rest of Kitsap would be more appropriate.

3. Do you have other comments?

Comprehensive planning requires involving for a connection to transit on the Edmonds side, so please work with Sound Transit and Community Transit. This from a daily rider-there needs to be good connections to make the future Seattle movement easier. Also, on this side, Kitsap Transit connections on the Kingston side.

Also, need to make a pitch for the current boats making an effort to meet the train (Sound Transit, Edmonds) daily TODAY! It does not appear that there are efforts being made to do this. Not clear it is an intent by the captains. I request this info be communicated so they try to meet these trains 7:06 and 6:30 AM. And give the minute or two sometimes needed in the PM at 5:50 and 5:10.

Comment Date: 4/6/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Shirley Bomgaars

Organization:

Comment:

In the near future, fare increases will be too high for me to continue to work on the East side of the Sound; it will be more economical to take a lower paying job in Kitsap County. By 2015, when the new Edmonds Terminal is expected to open, our family will no longer be able to afford to worship at our Edmonds church because the walk will be too far and the drive too expensive. We will no longer be able to walk over to Edmonds for a movie and a bite to eat - too far to walk and too expensive to drive. Are you seeing a theme here? This is what will happen to ridership-the ride will become more expensive, more impersonal, less fun. It will become a chore and that will build resentment towards the ferry system. Riders will have to transfer from one mass transit system - WSF - to another - Community Transit. Tourists will merely visit the terminal and watch the ferries glide by rather than take on the expense of a day trip to Kitsap county. I have enjoyed my compulserly exercise while walking to and from the ferry dock in Edmonds and will



miss it.

The people who work this particular run are the best - personable with all the passengers, striking up conversations and friendships and very rarely do they slam the door in your face as they watch you run wheezing up the ramp. These are the type of people who would increase ridership because they make the commute pleasant. I'll miss them when they are replaced by the scanners and turnstyles.

Did I pass along my thoughts on the fare increases at any of the community forums? Would it have done any good? I didn't think so.

Comment Date: 4/4/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Anonymous

Organization:

Comment:

Thank you for the updates. There are many who would benefit with the Kingston-Seattle foot ferry.

The sooner the better..... 2030 is a long time to wait for another entity to operate the passenger-only route.

Thank you all for all your hard work.....many appreciate your help.

Comment Date: 4/26/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Dennis Ceiske

Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

I think the Plan looks good except for two issues-

1) How are you going to coordinate with terminal communities for traffic management? Roads? Parking? Including ticket coordination with transportation services.

2) Obtaining operating cost subsidy from state to function as mass transit.

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding



framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

Appear to be no plans for Kingston terminal update-renovation-expansion?

Comment Date: 4/28/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: George Karl

Organization:

Comment:

Although it appears extensive cost and effort went into the information you provide the plain hard truth is that none of this will actually work... and no, I don't have the magic answer either.

I've been in the Kitsap area since 1983 and have seen this whole ferry situation falter over and over again (like foot ferries, etc.). I am surprised at how long it took to figure out that the Chinook's four turbocharged engines burned more fuel in one round trip than the Tacoma's four generators burns all day. Foot ferries just couldn't cover the cost of operations, even my 9 year old figured that out years ago but yet WSF still kept trying to make them viable. The money spent for the Tacoma, Wenatchee and Puyallup could have built a dozen Issaquah class boats with MUCH more overall capacity.

I commute on the Kingston/Edmonds ferry route to the "Seattle side" for work because Kitsap County just doesn't have any jobs. The costs have grown so high to commute (ferry fees, gas, etc.) that I eventually bought a motorcycle (which paid for itself in 20 months of recovered costs). But even toughing it out in the winter rain, the motorcycle eventually began to be costly also.

All these expenses just can't be sustained, ridership drops as fees go up, fees go up because ridership drops. People are trapped in a loop.

BUT the biggest problems you will face is the wait times and the space to put cars, etc. The roads here in Kitsap County that go to Bainbridge Island and Kingston are the same roads from a century ago (I think someone called them Cow Paths). The volume of traffic of course has increased to saturation 6 years ago... so how will "future" growth handle an already saturated corridor?

Edmonds has traffic backed up for miles into the city itself, blocking people's home driveways is the norm. I know the community of Edmonds doesn't like all "Kitsap's" commuters in their town.

Kingston's poor little town area can't handle anything hardly. The 2 lane road back to Poulsbo is bumper to bumper when the ferry traffic hits (and more and more stop lights are coming to slow things down more!).

Bainbridge has the same problems especially with the Agate pass bridge. One accident there and the State Patrol locks down the flow for hours (which I think that policy has to change too).



They ONLY break in traffic is when there is that 10-15 minute break in ferry traffic on those roads, putting more ferry boats on the runs will expand capacity but all that means is there will be a CONSTANT flow of traffic on these roads... if you can call 5 mph bumper to bumper traffic "flow".

We've seen it on Bainbridge years ago when 3 boats were operating... there was no way to join the traffic flow or cross the traffic flow with a boat unloading/loading so often.

Kitsap County doesn't have the road capacity to and from the ferry docks.

Kitsap County doesn't have the parking space, holding lane space, etc. for the amount of people projected.

Kitsap County doesn't have the coordinated public transit system that matches the ferry systems arrival/departure times.

And who in the world plans for the freight train to arrive at Edmonds when the ferry is loading or unloading? Nice timing there huh?

As you can see, there is just no possible way to address all the issues. Maybe the time has come where we just stop what we're doing and realize this is a "saturation" condition that cannot be corrected.

So there are 3 solutions...

Kitsap County gets it's head out it's rear and lets high paying companies with towering skyscrapers build here so all those Seattle commuters WON'T have to commute.

Kitsap County buys up all the land and builds elevated SUPER highways (6+ lanes with over passes, etc.) to handle the traffic volume.

A "super bug" epidemic kills off 80% of the worlds population.

What do YOU think is most likely to happen?

And don't get me started on that stupid Tacoma Narrows bridge thing...

Comment Date: 4/26/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Evan Stoll

Organization:

Comment:

Growth demands change. That change, however, must be planned and dealt with. My concern is traffic. The road cannot handle the increase! During the peak season I get blocked at intersections very frequently and occasionally on the highway itself. Also, where will the parking occur?



Comment Date: 4/22/2006

Contact Type: Letter

Name: Natalie Shippen

Organization:

Comment:

Edmonds has failed to provide for the May 2 public meeting that was advertised by the WSF in two consecutive editions of our local weekly, The enterprise. In those ads the public is invited to "Join us!" and "tell us what you think about" the long range WSF proposals related to the Edmonds/Kingston ferry run. The hour 7:00-8:00 PM was specified as the time.

The Strategic Plan notes that the WSF should consult with the public as it develops ferry plans or policy changes. That is what the ads promised to do. That offer is defeated by Edmonds failure to provide for a public meeting. While some other port towns, Bainbridge for example, will have two public meetings, Edmonds will have none.

I believe that the WSF should either insist upon compliance with the conditions of its public invitation, or set a meeting for another time and place in Edmonds. No municipality should be allowed to thwart the legal responsibility of the State to inform the public and solicit its opinion.

IV. North Sound Corridor



Comment Date: 5/9/2006

Contact Type: Letter

Name: Heather McCartney and Tom Hansen

Organization: City of Mukilteo

Comment:

The City of Mukilteo would like to thank WSF staff for allowing the city's review and comment on your long-range plan as we appreciate the staff's approach in working closely with hosting ferry communities since the impacts are so significant. First and foremost we would like to indicate that the readability and content of the Plan is improved over the 1998-2018 Plan. The city of Mukilteo is submitting in addition the following comments on the WSF Draft 2006-2030 Long-Range Strategic Plan.

1) Integrate-Seamless Ferry and Highway System-The Plan mentions providing a seamless intermodal transportation system, but there is no mention of the need to work closely with WSDOT highways to time the highways improvements with a similar timeframe rather than making improvements on only the ferries or separately on the highways. Ferry terminals and highways leading to the terminals need to have adequate capacity and holding lanes (not just for average weekday levels) in order for the host community's transportation system to function. Joint planning, capital funding, and project timing should be addressed within this plan related to the Mukilteo ferry as well as the needed highway capital improvements. The Plan needs to be done jointly with WSDOT Highways as the ferry system is an extension of the state highway system and not as an isolated system.

2) Plan Assumes Mukilteo includes A Duel Slip Configuration that is Not Fully Funded and the EIS is Not Complete-The Plan assumes the new Mukilteo Multimodal terminal includes a duel slip configuration by 2010. This assumption is incorrect as the second slip is not funded and no timeline has been specified. The Plan needs to be amended to show that this new facility will be built in two phases. It is also difficult for the Plan to show this since the environmental work for the Mukilteo Multimodal Station is neither in draft nor in final form.

3) Third Ferry is Needed Sooner to Assist with Extended Back-ups on State Highways-The Plan also indicates that a third boat is not needed until 2018 in the summer and 2022 for year-around demand. The plan bases the need on average demand mid-week non-peak season. The Plan also shows brining a third boat on for the summer season in 2018 for two years before having it scheduled on the run year around. The City of Mukilteo feels that a third boat will be needed sooner to handle peak Wednesday, Thursday and Friday nights for five (5) months of the year. We will have traffic backed up the Mukilteo Speedway past 76th Street on Wednesday and Thursday nights and past Paine Field Boulevard on Friday nights with a 4-hour plus wait. Even when the second slip is build (although there is no funding nor a specific date set for when this will occur) this will only provide some relief. To wait until 2020, with Whidbey Island's growth rates increasing, just does not seem realistic for our community; unless Paine Field Blvd Extension was build. With the PFB Extension the community could handle more lengthy back-ups.



4. Change Averaging Ferry Back-ups Methodology & Make Plan Consistent with Mukilteo Traffic Analysis for new Mukilteo Terminal-The Plan also uses a congestion standard for weekday peak period demand. The planning for ferry terminals may work correctly with this assumption, but the off-site stacking needs/holding lanes do not and thus a different standard is needed and should be added to the plan. The plan should at least include stacking needs for Wednesday, Thursday and Friday night commutes during the shoulder seasons. We are not asking WSF's plan to provide for worst case at holiday weekends. The plan should also do an analysis for stacking for peak season Friday nights, so that it clear what host communities and the highway system has to deal with on a weekly basis for five months of the year.

The Draft Plan traffic analysis is not consistent with the draft traffic analysis documents for the Mukilteo Multimodal Terminal. Please rectify these differences for the Final Plan. The Plan needs to reflect his more current data.

5. Upland Traffic Impacts, Intersection/Segment LOS, and Capital Costs are addressed in Mukilteo 2004 Transportation Plan-Upland traffic Impacts are unique to ferry operations and their host communities. This is because the ferry system has unique operations. There are stacking and off-loading platoons that affect the state highway systems that feed into and provide access from the ferry terminals. The analysis is not straight forward or simple as compared to other traffic analyses and most traffic engineers do not adjust or compensate for these unique operational issues. The Plan should include the intersection and segment level of service (LOS) information in Mukilteo including the location, improvements needed and the costs. Again WSDOT Highways needs to coordinate closely on these issues and with host communities to resolve future problems that will allow the ferry operations to work efficiently when loading and off-loading. Off-loading directly impacts the function of the highway system and local road intersections that must be addressed in the Plan.

6) Rate of Travel for Whidbey Island Outdated and Alternative Route off the Island at Capacity during Peak Hour-The information used for Whidbey Island is outdated as the population and employment numbers projected do not address the substantial growth that is occurring to both increased job opportunities in Snohomish County, specifically at Boeing and that baby boomers are relocating to Whidbey Island for an active lifestyle that includes greater frequency of ferry use to access mainland education and other activities. The north access point, the Deception Pass Bridge, is already at capacity during peak periods and Whidbey Island residents are not choosing this access point to depart the island unless it is to travel northward. The Plan does take this into account for Bainbridge Island. A similar analysis should also be used for Whidbey Island.

7) Support Parking Structure for Mukilteo Multimodal Station-The City of Mukilteo supports the parking structure noted in the Plan for the Mukilteo Multimodal Ferry Terminal. The amount of available upland is restricted on Mukilteo's waterfront and the best use of the available property is to have the footprint of new ferry terminal be as small as possible. Accommodation of the pedestrian promenade along the water as well as plaza and park space also conform to the Mukilteo 2005 Comprehensive Plan.

8) Off-site park and Ride needs to be added as Alternative Parking Long-term-The Plan needs



to identify that a Community Transit Park and Ride will be located uphill from the Mukilteo terminal (e.g. SR 526 and Paine Field Boulevard extension) and that this is a long term solution to decrease vehicle demand and encourage pedestrian riders out into the future.

9) Support Larger Boats that Add Vehicle and Passenger Capacity-The City of Mukilteo supports WSF's Plan that puts larger ferries on the Mukilteo to Clinton run. This will help by expanding the capacity for both vehicles and passengers at each sailing and this will also assist with reducing the staging of vehicles along the state highways.

That concludes the City of Mukilteo comments on the draft 2006-2030 Plan. We are willing to work with you to clarify any of these comments and would appreciate knowing whether they will be addressed as part of the Final Plan. We would also like to request copies of the PSRC, CTED and City of Bainbridge comment letters before the Final Plan.

Comment Date: 4/28/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Pat Ryan

Organization:

Comment:

I don't like the proposed change to a larger boat running every 90 minutes. My vote is for 2 smaller boats running every 45 minutes, 12 months per year. Put the \$ required to alter Keystone to better use by funding the increased operating costs of 2 pilots, 2 mates etc.

Ridership stats are skewed by people's refusal to use the PT-Keystone ferry due to long waits.

After 3 times having to wait 3 hours! To come westbound from Keystone to Port Townsend, I no longer use that ferry. I go to Edmonds and take that ferry, even when coming home from Bellingham. And that's at spring break which is not even the tourist season!! That is rotten ferry service!!!



Comment Date: 5/7/2006

Contact Type: Letter

Name: Bruce Howard

Organization:

Comment:

Re:Mukilteo Terminal Passenger Ticketing Procedure.

Pertinent to the profoundly stupid passenger ticketing arrangement at Mukilteo, was the question I asked some years ago; By what justification did the DOT increase the administrative personnel load within the ferry system by over 300% during the course of their management stint? According to a long-time ferry worker friend of mine, the administrative load was fewer than 90 people prior to the DOT's hiring binge. When I wrote my letter questioning the increase, that number had climbed to over 300. That was prior to nine-eleven, so I don't see how that could be the reason. Perhaps it took a couple of hundred new people sitting at 200 new computers to "do the math" for a new passenger only run to Bremerton. My point is this: If the DOT can hire some 300 so new people to do what fewer than 100 were doing for years prior to their take-over, Why can't they find one person to handle passenger ticketing at the passenger ticketing window at Mukilteo during all the hours the ferries are operating?

Image this situation: My brother-in-law and his family fly in from Tallahassee, Florida, grab the airport shuttle, and are delivered to the Mukilteo dock in mid-afternoon. After unloading baggage and young kids, they walk to the passenger only ticket window to buy their tickets. They are told that one of them must cross the road [Hwy525] as the cars are unloading, walk up to one of the auto ticketing booths, wait for cars to clear, then stand at the window to purchase their tickets. Then, they must return to the dock to board the ferry. Sounds easy, right? What if the family member delivered to the dock waiting area at the "wrong time of day" was in her 70's, used a walker to get around, had baggage for a two-week stay, and the weather was rainy with a wind blowing - and she was told that she had to walk up to the auto ticketing area to buy her ticket? Get the picture? Well, now comes the real information. On April 5, 2006, a sister-in-law coming to Whidbey with her brother to attend my son's memorial had just called to let us know that she and her brother would be on the 230PM boat. Just after making the call, he was told that he had to run up the ferry lanes to the ticket booth to buy his ticket before he could board the boat. Four minutes later, we received another call from his sister - hysterical at the time, as she had just watched her brother get slammed into by one of the cars heading away from the ticket booth to make the 230PM boat. I had to come across from Clinton a few hours later to pick him up at Providence Hospital in Everett. That was on April 5th. With serious muscle and soft tissue damage, he is still at his home in Las Vegas on leave from his work as a Heath Inspector for the City of Las Vegas. He can't walk without crutches. Does it take a law suit to get the brain-dead management of the ferry system to wake up and realize that they needlessly put people in harm's way by making them purchase walk-on tickets at the auto toll booth? Evidently, yes. I am not normally a litigious person, however, I concur with my brother-in-law's decision to sue the Washington State Ferry System as well as the person in the car that



hit him.

So, DOT: 1] Explain why you can hire 200+ new administrative employees after taking over the ferry system. Note: The answer given to me at the WSF main office in Seattle after asking that same question was, "Well,[head scratching in progress]..... "We have much better accountability now". I thought that answer was abysmal then and I feel even more so now. 2] Explain why your agency can hire hundreds of people, but can't afford to have a ticket seller at the window near the dock where most limo drop-offs occur? It will likely take a half-dozen law suits before they get the point. The passenger ticketing system sucks at Mukilteo, especially for first-time visitors or elderly passengers or young mothers with a child in her arms and another in a stroller. What ferry worker wants the task of telling a young mother and her kids that they must go back up the hill, buy their tickets, then make their way back down and cross a busy intersection in order to walk on the boat? None of them. It's the WSF leadership in the hands of the DOT that needs their butts kicked. Fiscally irresponsible, and dumb as well. What a sad combination.

Comment Date: 4/17/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Robin Adams

Organization:

Comment:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on your draft plan. I downloaded a copy from the web and I attended one of your meetings in Seattle.

In summary my opinion is that while WSF currently offers a good service, what has been presented is a "business as usual" plan that is not sustainable on a 25 year basis. I have the following suggestions for

improvement:

- (1) do not try to accommodate growth on an open ended basis but plan to consciously shift a significantly higher portion of the overall traffic, particularly commuters, to high occupancy vehicles and public transport
- (2) base your planning on a fair and rational analysis of delay that is consistent across routes
- (3) do not single out the Keystone-Pt Townsend route for a cut in service quality when its growth is expected to be similar to many other routes where service improvements are planned
- (4) modify the strategy of purchasing only one kind of large sized boat by adding smaller boats to serve lower volume routes efficiently
- (5) abandon the one price strategy fits all approach and create a route-specific pricing strategy to give ferry users appropriate signals to encourage a fundamentally more efficient use of ferry



capacity

(6) engage the stakeholders in a more constructive dialogue about a long-term funding solution based on an economically rational analysis of total resources that is fair from the perspective of the state as a whole

(7) recognize that you have a serious cost control issue and develop a medium-term strategy to address it

I have prepared a report which sets out the reasons for these recommendations in more detail. This is attached as a PDF file.

(See attached file: WSF Draft Plan Adams Comments.pdf)

Comment on WSF Draft Long-Range Plan 2006-2030

Background In April 2006 WSF presented its draft long-range plan for the period 2006-2030 and invited public comment thereon. The author of this report is a resident of Whidbey Island, a frequent user of the two ferry routes serving the island, and an occasional user of other ferry routes. He is also a management consultant specializing in international commodity markets, one of the founders of a London-based shipping consultancy, and a member of various environmental organizations active on the local (Whidbey Island), state, and national levels. The comments contained in this document do not, however, necessarily reflect the views of these other entities. These comments are divided into four areas, as follows: (1) conceptual issues; comments about the overall focus and priorities of the plan; (2) environmental issues; comments about the environmental aspects of the plan and in particular sustainability issues; (3) service issues; comments about the level of service implicit in the plan; (4) economic issues; comments about the economic analysis underlying the plan and the overall level of resource efficiency implicit in it; and (5) financial issues; comments about the way in which WSF proposes to finance the plan. Many of these issues overlap. However, the author hopes that structuring his comments in this way will be helpful to WSF in identifying ways in which its plan can be significantly improved. Conceptual Issues WSF runs an extremely reliable, safe and surprisingly affordable service, which is, in my experience, significantly higher quality than most other public transportation systems. WSF does not appear to comprehensively benchmark itself against its counterparts elsewhere (particularly BC Ferries, Scandlines and Caledonian MacBrayne). As a basic management discipline, it should do so, not only to enhance the public's understanding of the quality of service we enjoy, but also because even a good performance can be improved by learning from the experience of others. Business as Usual Planning Concept Against this fundamentally satisfactory background, WSF has presented a plan that can be summarized as "business as usual". The system envisaged for 2030 is basically the same as that which is operated today – just a bit bigger.

In 2030 most routes will have

slightly bigger boats; some will have more frequent service; and fares will be about the same in real terms as today. The assumption, implicit in this plan, is that current trends in the lifestyles of



residents of Puget Sound are sustainable more or less indefinitely and that the job of WSF is to accommodate them. In my opinion, which is described in detail below, this assumption is, if not false, at least highly questionable. Forecast Basis is Undesirable/Unsustainable WSF's traffic forecasts show very steep growth in total riders in the period 2010-2020. In its presentation WSF stated that this was because there would be very large increases in residential development in Kitsap County, but the bulk of the job growth would be on the east side of Puget Sound. WSF obtained this forecast from the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC). Such a trend is very likely to prove unsustainable. It is incompatible with any reasonable environmental and energy conservation goals. It implies an unacceptably poor quality of life in an age when telecommuting is becoming increasingly feasible for many workers. The reality of large-scale urbanization is that fewer, not more, people are able to use private cars. The proportion of commuting journeys by private car is much smaller in large cities like New York and London than in smaller cities like Seattle. Moreover, the quantity of land that has to be given over to car parking structures is just not compatible with the preservation of a vibrant downtown. As Seattle grows, commuting by automobile must decline – not increase. Atlanta, Houston and Los Angeles are examples of cities that have tried to build their way out of congestion. They have largely failed to do this, but in the process have created massive suburban sprawl. The topography of our region makes this even less sustainable in Puget Sound. WSF's estimates of walk-on passenger traffic arriving in Seattle, which are derived from the PSRC model, are extreme, indicating serious problems with its assumptions or structure or both. Exhibit 18, page 42, shows that in 2003 walk-on arrivals in downtown Seattle (almost all from Bainbridge Island and Bremerton) amounted to 4.6 million. By 2030 this figure is expected to be 13.6 million – three times as much! What other major U.S. city has experienced such growth in commuting in such a short period? It is unwise, to say the least, to create a plan around such an “incredible” forecast. Primarily an Engineering-Based Plan The plan also appears to be driven mainly by a technical (engineering) perspective. In essence, it represents WSF's current thinking on the best way to meet growth within the confines of the current business model. However, that falls well short of the mandates given by federal and state guidelines as summarized in Exhibit 3, page 6. In respect of the federal guidelines, for example, the plan pays minimal attention to its environmental impact and the mandates to increase energy efficiency and improve the quality of life. It places insufficient emphasis on the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, and it does not address a number of obvious issues relating to efficient management.

In respect of the state guidelines, there is little said about such matters as the preservation of downtowns and the creation of intermodal transportation links. One example will illustrate this one-dimensional thinking. There are two ferry routes, Clinton-Mukilteo and Kingston-Edmonds, that terminate adjacent to the Everett-Seattle “Sounder” rail line. During the plan period, the number of ferries operating on these routes is planned to increase from 4 to 7, the largest net increase in the system. However, these are the two routes where the proper development of the “Sounder” rail system, combined with appropriate price signals, could credibly shift a large portion of the commuter traffic from private cars to public transport. Is it better to spend \$225 million on three new ferries and a further \$250 million on new terminals, rather than spending these sums on alleviating rail track constraints that prevent a sensible (minimum hourly) service frequency, which would also benefit hundreds of thousands of people in Snohomish and King Counties who do not use the ferries? In short, WSF appears to have developed this plan without taking the time to “think outside the box” and to consider broader issues of environmental impact, resource efficiency, and financial prudence. Not Integrated with Other Transit Plans The



requirement to “integrate” WSF with other transportation modes, which appears in both federal and state guidelines, has not been effectively handled. For example, the plan envisages 2.6 million people per year (over 10,000 per working day) arriving in Seattle from Kingston in 2030 via a passenger-only ferry operated by someone else. The economics of this appear to be questionable. What happens if the service does not materialize? The legislature has instructed WSF to operate vehicle ferries. This does not mean that WSF can ignore walk-on passenger issues. It just means that WSF may not operate passenger only ferries. WSF will still be carrying the vast majority of ferry passengers in the region and needs to plan for this in a more integrated manner with other transit operators. Environmental Issues Most thoughtful people recognize that the single most intractable environmental issue that the U.S. faces is, to use the words of President Bush, its “addiction” to fossil fuels. The fuel that WSF uses in its boats represents only a tiny part of the overall fossil fuel impact of its operations. It is clear that U.S. oil and gas consumption has already peaked. We cannot be sure about world production, except that we do know that oil prices are extremely volatile and that supply comes disproportionately from undemocratic and unstable countries. We also know that auto emissions are the single largest source of pollution in the country.

The WSF plan has the potential to either encourage or discourage a shift from private to public transport, with fuel implications far beyond its own use.¹ Instead, its plan passively “accommodates” so-called planned growth. There is one major exception to this. WSF does not plan to accommodate growth on the Bainbridge-Seattle route, because both the city of Seattle and the Bainbridge community object to the added traffic. Instead, WSF is going to use congestion, combined with service improvements on the Kingston-Edmonds and Bremerton-Seattle routes, to induce residents of Kitsap County to select these ways of getting to the mainland. WSF needs to recognize that there are similar alternatives on other routes. Specifically, the Clinton-Mukilteo, Kingston-Edmonds and Vashon-Fauntleroy runs all offer the possibility of encouraging carpooling, and in the first two cases, encourage a big switch to public transit. The way to do this would be to increase walk-on traffic by eliminating passenger fares on these routes and offset the revenue loss by raising vehicle fares. The following table shows that vehicle fares would have to rise by 20%-25%.²

Route	Clinton-Mukilteo	Kingston-Edmonds	Vashon-Fauntleroy
Ridership, 2005			

Fare Implications of Free Ridership for Passengers

The table shows that a car with two people would pay fractionally less than today under this approach. A car with three people would come out well ahead. The state already offers privileges to multiple-occupancy cars in the form of HOV lanes. This proposal is merely an extension of that concept. My opinion is that this would reduce peak hour

¹ In general WSF can save fuel by moving to bigger boats, which are inherently more fuel efficient. The saving, however, is minimal in relation to the effect WSF can potentially have on the decisions of individuals to use public or private transport for specific journeys, to car pool, etc. ² The calculations have been performed assuming that a car and driver pay approximately 3.5 times the fare for a passenger traffic on these routes and significantly push back the date when new ferry service is needed with major savings in terms of capital costs for vessels and terminals. Commuter journeys offer the best potential for a switch to public transport, because large numbers of people are moving in a predictable manner. Thus, it is critical for WSF’s plan to be integrated with the “Sounder” rail expansion. It is not going to be adequate to have 3 or 4



peak-hour trains into Seattle in the morning and out in the evening. That is no better than today's direct commuter bus. What is needed is a minimum hourly service whose schedule is coordinated with the boats at Edmonds and Mukilteo and with the airport light rail in Seattle. That way public transport becomes a viable option for the vast majority of trips to Seattle and its airport for the traffic originating in Kingston and Clinton. It should be noted that the ratio of passengers to vehicles is much higher on the Bainbridge and Bremerton routes into Seattle (and likely to be higher on the proposed Southworth route). Consequently, this concept does not apply to those routes, nor to the tourist dominated seasonal routes at Keystone and in the San Juans. However, the Tahlequah-Pt Defiance and Vashon-Southworth routes are also ones where WSF should consider eliminating passenger fares. If WSF reoriented its plan so that it accommodates growth primarily by increasing the utilization of its capacity by diverting increased commuter traffic to high occupancy vehicles or public transit, there would be two main environmental gains: (1) direct fuel and emissions savings by commuters; and (2) less environmental impact from vessel and terminal construction. Service Issues Arbitrary and Inconsistent Standards The service concept behind the plan is based on "boat wait" standards set by the Washington State Transportation Commission (WSTC), although in practice WSF has considerable input into this process. These standards have been translated into "minutes" by WSF. When WSF forecasts that vehicles will have to wait longer than the standard minutes, this triggers additional service. The standards relate conditions that prevail on a typical Wednesday in May. This basic concept is arbitrary, has been applied in an inequitable manner, and is in any case inappropriate for several of the routes involved. Specifically, it is the basis for a fundamentally wrong decision to cut service on one route – Keystone-Pt Townsend. The number of minutes of delay that is used by WSF as the basis for the plan varies by a factor of three, from a low of 35 minutes for Fauntleroy-Vashon to a high of 100 minutes for Seattle-Bainbridge. It is obvious that the boat wait standard cannot be less than the headway on each route.

However, it is totally inequitable to establish a 60-minute standard at Mukilteo versus a 35-minute standard at Vashon (on a route of identical length) just because the headway on the former is a mere 5 minutes less than on the latter. Equally, why should Bainbridge get penalized with a 100-minute standard while Edmonds gets a 40-minute standard? The headway on Bainbridge is very close to the average headway on the commuter routes as a whole. A 50-minute standard would be comparable to the average on other routes. WSF argues that a 100-minute standard on Bainbridge is the same as a 75-minute standard on Bremerton because the Bremerton voyage is 25 minutes longer, thus yielding a similar overall journey time. An equivalent proposition is to argue that Alaska Airlines' flights to San Francisco can, on average, suffer 30 minute longer delays than their flights to Los Angeles because the scheduled flight time is 30 minutes less. This is ridiculous. People have a legitimate expectation that trips with a shorter schedule should take less overall time than trips with a longer schedule. Even if WSF's rationale is accepted, it is applied inconsistently. Let's compare journeys from Seattle to Vashon Island and Seattle to Whidbey Island. Allow 30 minutes to drive to Fauntleroy, 35 minutes wait and 15 minutes crossing – total 80 minutes. Now allow 60 minutes to drive to Mukilteo, 60 minutes wait and 15 minutes crossing – total 135 minutes. On that argument WSF should apply a 2-boat wait standard at Fauntleroy and a 1-boat wait standard at Mukilteo! To its credit WSF has not attempted to apply the "boat wait" standard to the San Juan routes, where missing a sailing can mean a delay of several hours. However, it has applied the standard to Keystone-Port Townsend, which is not a commuter route and has far more in common with the San Juan



routes than it does with the genuine commuter routes. The main characteristic of the routes in the San Juan's and Keystone are their extreme seasonality. Seasonality can be roughly measured by comparing traffic in the third quarter of the year (the summer months) with either annual average traffic or traffic in the first quarter of the year (the winter months). This has been done on the table overleaf.

Excluding the Sydney routes, where seasonality is exaggerated by the absence of winter service, Keystone-Port Townsend is actually the most seasonal route in the system and, therefore, the least similar route. WSF gathers its boat wait data by a survey conducted on a weekday afternoon in May. Not surprisingly, this shows that Keystone-Port Townsend is more than adequately served. Exhibit 10 shows there is no need to add service on this route, even by 2030. Yet Exhibit 18 shows that vehicle traffic is expected to increase from 371,250 in 2003 to 530,500 by 2030. Most of that increase is likely to be tourist-related and concentrated in the summer. Already, there are many occasions on summer weekends when 2- or 3-boat waits are experienced on this route. It is also the case that very long seasonal delays are common on San Juan routes. WSF's website routinely recommends vehicles arrive as much as 2 hours before a sailing to be assured of a place during peak periods. This is the equivalent of a 4-boat wait at Mukilteo or Fauntleroy! WSF needs to make two methodological changes to address these issues. First, it needs to adopt a fair and consistent standard. If WSF decides to assess service on the basis of the 15th busiest day of the year,³ then it needs to realize that that day is potentially a different one on each route. ³ This is probably reasonable since it will avoid the distortions produced by holiday weekends on commuter routes while still capturing seasonal issues on tourist routes.

Second, using this fair and consistent standard, WSF needs to calculate a probability-adjusted total cost of delay. This can be measured by looking at what happens to the vehicles that arrive in each 15-minute window⁴. What is the probability distribution of the loading time of the vehicles in each of these windows? This probability-adjusted measure of cost will give a fairer picture, because it will automatically capture the effect of longer headways on some routes. Service Quality Cuts at Keystone While there are probably many consequences of using the arbitrary standards, the most obvious "loser" is the Keystone-Port Townsend route. This becomes very clear when we examine the following table. The traffic forecasts are taken from Exhibit 18 and the WSF Plan is summarized from Exhibit 12. The table compares what WSF thinks is going to happen with what WSF proposes to do about it. The analysis goes out to 2020 in order to capture WSF major initiatives related to the South Sound and the San Juans.

The Keystone route is expected to grow at less than the average – but not by a great deal

However, it is the only route in the system where WSF actually proposes to reduce the quality of the service offered. Currently, two small boats that carry 64 cars serve Keystone. One operates 16 hours a day year round. The other operates 8 hours a day 5 months a year (May-October). Exhibit 12 shows that these will be replaced with a 124-car vessel operating year round. While WSF will undoubtedly say that this increases capacity on an annual basis, it does not increase capacity on a seasonal basis – when capacity is needed. Technically, it reduces capacity by about 3%. More seriously, it means that summer service will be reduced from a 45-minute headway to a 90-minute headway. ⁴ The measurement cycle for a sailing will need to start and



end 15 minutes prior to scheduled departure, since people arriving less than 15 minutes ahead cannot reasonably expect to be loaded on that sailing.

The Keystone ferry is part of a popular tourist driving circuit around the northwest. Making it less convenient and failing to address the serious seasonal delays that already occur will reduce the attractiveness of this itinerary for tourists, with adverse impacts on the businesses on Whidbey Island and the Olympic Peninsula that cater to them. In the context of a plan that generally proposes to improve service in response to demand growth, it is completely unfair to single out one route⁵ for differentially poor treatment in this way.

Economic Issues

Surprisingly, the WSF plan has remarkably little to say about economic issues. In my opinion, the predominantly technical basis for this plan has resulted in WSF losing perspective with regard to a number of fundamental economic issues. As a consequence, the plan does not appear to be optimized from a long-term economic resource perspective. Standard Boat Strategy The main result of this is that WSF proposes to adopt a fundamentally mistaken vessel procurement strategy. WSF plans to buy only one type of vessel – the expanded Issaquah class – that carries 144 cars. It plans to eliminate its 64-car Steel Electric vessels and eventually its 87-car Evergreen vessels. While it is clearly easier to maintain and operate only one type of vessel, this is not necessarily the economically efficient result. As pointed out earlier, WSF serves two fundamentally different markets – commuters and tourists. The commuter market is characterized by daily peak demand – eastbound in the morning and westbound in the afternoon. Commuters represent a time critical market – the majority want to arrive and leave about the same time of day. Tourists are not as time critical, but they are season critical. People tend to go on vacation when the weather is fine and when schools are out. In WSF, as in most businesses, there are tradeoffs between capital and operating costs. For example, instead of scrapping an Evergreen vessel in 2010, WSF could spend \$25 million refurbishing it for another 30 years. Alternatively, WSF could spend \$75 million on one of its expanded Issaquah vessels. The latter would have lower operating costs than the former. This is the philosophy that drives the plan. In serving peak demand, operating costs are not very important. The reason is that, by definition, peak demand lasts only for a short time. Capital costs are critical, however. Peak services imply unused capital sitting idle the rest of the year. In other words, the tradeoff between refurbishing an old vessel and buying a new vessel is going to be quite different depending on the role – base load or peak – that is intended for the vessel.

⁵ Technically, no improvements are planned on the Bainbridge route either, but other considerations related to the inability to move additional traffic through the road system that feeds the terminal is the key factor. Only at Keystone is service being effectively cut by WSF on a voluntary basis.

The electric power industry provides a good example. Coal and nuclear powered stations have high capital costs but low operating costs. They serve base load demand. Gas powered stations have low capital costs but high operating costs, reflecting the fact that gas is a substitute for high priced oil. Thus they tend to serve for peak loads. In other words, by planning to purchase only one type of vessel, WSF demonstrates that it has not properly evaluated the classic tradeoff between operating costs and capital costs that exist in almost all economic decisions. The most likely explanation is that WSF has to meet operating costs largely from fares, while it



covers its capital costs with grants from the state. However, in order to make economically efficient decisions, WSF needs to get beyond the institutional structure in which it operates and look at the real resources that it plans to consume. The WSF plan, in fact, demonstrates quite convincingly that there is a market for two types of boat, both the 144-car expanded Issaquah and another boat in the 80- to 90-car range – probably a single deck vessel. Given that the Steel Electric vessels have to be replaced, WSF will either have to buy special vessels that fit into Keystone Harbor, or they will have to enlarge the harbor. Let's examine these two scenarios, recognizing that WSF has not yet made up its mind. If they buy special vessels with the same car carrying capacity as the Steel Electrics, they will actually need to buy not two, but three, of these vessels. The reason is that should one vessel break down in the summer, they will not have another vessel that is able to fit into Keystone Harbor. That vessel will not, of course, sit idle. It will be employed elsewhere. If a breakdown occurs, an Issaquah replacement will be provided for the other routes so the third special vessel can be transferred to Keystone. Where might such a vessel be employed? A Steel Electric currently operates the San Juan Interisland service. During the plan it will be upsized first to an Evergreen vessel (87 cars) and then to Sealth (90 cars). In addition, a vessel of this size will be ideal for the dedicated Lopez route when it is introduced. Finally, Pt Defiance-Tahlequah is due to be upsized to the Evergreen vessel during the plan period. In fact, the eventual market by 2030 is for six vessels in this size range as follows: (1) Keystone-Pt Townsend – 2 initially, a 3rd summer vessel in about 20 years; (2) Interisland – 1 initially; (3) Anacortes-Lopez – 1 in about 10 years; and (4) Pt Defiance-Tahlequah – 1 in about 10 years. Compared with an immediate demand for 3 vessels and an eventual demand for 6, WSF has 8 vessels in the relevant size range, 4 Steel Electrics, 3 Evergreen, and 1 Sealth. However, it is proposing to scrap the Steel Electrics and one Evergreen by 2011. At that point WSF will be short of vessels of the right size for these routes.

As an alternative to reducing the quality of the Keystone-Port Townsend service, WSF was asked why they would not deploy two Evergreen vessels on this route. Rehabilitating rather than scrapping the Evergreen State in 2011 could supply one of these. WSF stated, however, that the other two Evergreen vessels were required for the San Juan Interisland service and the third Edmonds-Kingston vessel. In fact, the versatility of these vessels is evident for the way in which they will be actively redeployed around the system every year or two. One vessel goes to Pt Defiance in 2015 and another to Clinton in 2018. Another vessel that is in high demand around the system is Sealth. In fact, the detailed planning scenario presented by WSF provides fairly convincing anecdotal evidence that WSF needs vessels of this size. If we discard the concept of downgrading the Keystone service as fundamentally unfair, then the issue at Keystone boils down to this: (1) buy three new special vessels, reducing the initial expanded Issaquah order by two; or (2) spend the capital dollars to expand the harbor and to keep the Evergreen vessel planned for retirement.⁶ In evaluating these two options, WSF needs to look at the total capital and operating costs involved, taking into account the time value of money and the option value associated with having a larger fleet of smaller vessels. Given the highly seasonal nature of the Keystone route, a strategy that trades higher operating costs for lower capital costs is certainly worth examining. Use of Pricing to Influence Behavior The plan displays little or no awareness of the role that price signals can potentially play in promoting a more efficient use of resources. Effectively, the plan proposes freezing the current structure of relative and absolute prices in real terms. The financial consequences of this are further discussed below. However, there is an additional dimension. Price is not simply a reward earned by WSF for providing a service, it is also a way of sending appropriate signals to buyers. Managing demand by congestion is a



form of rationing, and as such is inefficient. While it is clearly impractical for WSF (and any business) to cater to absolute peak demand, it should not develop a long-term plan based on some arbitrary assumption as to the acceptable level of congestion. WSF is missing an opportunity to be much more creative with the pricing structures that it employs. A prime example is the Bainbridge route. For a number of good reasons it is not technically possible to increase service. Therefore, it is important for WSF to encourage

6 The second Evergreen vessel comes from Kingston, which under this scenario gets the Issaquah vessel originally intended for Keystone.

discretionary traffic to and from the Olympic Peninsula to use other routes. One way to do this would be to have a significantly higher fare than on alternate routes, regardless of distance. To avoid burdening commuters, WSF could offset this by increasing the discount on multi-user books. Another variant would be to have two levels of discount for multi-users, a standard discount in peak hours and a higher discount for off-peak hours. As discussed above, three commuter routes – Mukilteo, Edmonds and Fauntleroy – have a significantly lower ratio of passengers to vehicles than the Seattle routes. More passengers on these routes could be encouraged by eliminating passenger fares altogether. Variable pricing could also help on seasonal routes. Premium prices could be charged on peak days with the revenue used to reduce fares at off-peak times. This would leave regular travelers in the same position on an annual average basis but would improve revenues from less price-sensitive tourist traffic. The current WSF approach is a “one price fits all” model, with a relatively minor seasonal component on all routes. However, this is a long-term plan. WSF will eventually move to electronic ticketing, at which point a far more flexible and sophisticated approach becomes practical.

The adoption of more creative pricing policies may very well affect the demand for ferry service. At minimum, WSF should be trying to even out the flow of traffic to make better average use of its capital, given the high level of fixed costs in its system. Of the \$13 billion that WSF plans to spend over the next 25 years, direct vessel operating and maintenance costs are only \$5 billion. Yet the plan contains no proposals to increase the efficiency with which WSF uses its fixed capital. Financial Issues Heavy Reliance on Subsidies In recent years WSF has received a great deal of criticism for increasing fares. In turn WSF blames I-695, which removed a tax subsidy to WSF, for this necessity. A proper planning process needs to probe behind these essentially political statements. The reality, shown in Exhibit 8, is that ferry fares declined sharply in the 25-year period between 1975 and 2000. In real (i.e. inflation-adjusted) terms, the Central Sound car and driver full fare fell from more than \$12 to just over \$7. There is absolutely no evidence to believe that this fare reduction stemmed from fundamental improvements in productivity and cost reduction, nor that it was representative of the general course of public transit fares in North America, or, for that matter, globally. Basically, the fare fell because the ferry system managed to attract ever-increasing subsidies. The exhibit shows that the increases now taking place merely return the fares to the average level of the 1970s.

The level of public dialogue on this issue is very low. WSF needs to provide more leadership. At the very least, WSF should benchmark itself against other ferry systems around the world in terms of fare levels and subsidies so that a more informed debate can be conducted. Ostensibly, the WSF plan is based on the revenues from fares rising to 100% of operating costs. In reality, Exhibit 28 shows that, over the 25 year period, fares and miscellaneous revenue will be \$7.5 billion, whereas expenses will be \$13.2 billion. One way or another, WSF



proposes to raise \$5.9 billion from various taxes and subsidies. In the last biennium fare revenue will be \$937 million compared with total expenses of \$1.35 billion. This apparent improvement can largely be traced to a gap in the vessel and terminal improvement programs, which will not be permanently sustainable. Is it prudent to rely on such a large and continuing level of subsidy? How does this per capita subsidy compare to subsidies to users of other public transit systems in Puget Sound, across the State of Washington, and around the country? What will happen to fares if some or all of this is not forthcoming? And if fares are much higher, what will happen to demand and what implications does this have for vessel choice and other investment priorities? Ultimately, this plan will have to be approved and funded by the legislature. In my opinion it does not provide elected representatives with the information they need to determine whether the requested subsidies are fair and reasonable in relation to the many competing demands that exist. Nor does it outline the real choices that exist and their consequences for the affected parties. Lack of Financial Creativity The plan misses an opportunity to engage the public and their elected representatives in a constructive dialogue about funding issues. In my opinion this is largely a function of the way the financial plan is presented. This presentation reflects state accounting concepts rather than economic realities. A better approach is to prepare a plan that reflects economic realities and then translate this into the accounting concepts required by the institutional process.⁷ The ferry system, as with most businesses, basically has three types of costs: (1) truly variable operating costs (the costs that increase or decrease in proportion to the number of hours that the vessels are operating); (2) quasi-fixed costs (these are costs that reflect the overall structure and quality of the network that will be operated; they are variable in the long-term but fixed in the short-term); and (3) fixed costs (these are all the rest of the costs).

⁷ This is not a radical suggestion. Most businesses have management accounts that they use to drive the strategic and tactical decisions involved in running the business. These are distinct from the statutory accounts they prepare for regulatory and tax purposes.

Truly variable costs are what WSF calls operating costs, except for the management component but including emergency repairs. Over the 25-year period, this comes to \$6.4 billion. Quasi-fixed costs are the costs involved in basically maintaining the system as it is. This includes management costs and terminal and vessel preservation

8. To vary these costs up or down takes a strategic decision to increase or reduce service – to expand or contract the network. Once the plan is approved, these costs are fixed. Over the 25-year period, this comes to \$5.3 billion. The truly fixed costs are the debt service and the proposed new capital for terminals and vessels. These account for the remaining \$1.5 billion. Presenting the figures this way can help create a constructive debate about the proper level of state subsidy. For instance, the state has an implicit obligation to expand state highways to meet demand in some equitable manner. Provided WSF can establish (which is not attempted in this plan) that its “highways” have reached the point where they need expanding, then the case for a \$1.5 billion state subsidy is potentially justifiable. Maintaining the system, by a similar analogy, is likely to be split between different levels of government and users. For instance, drivers pay gasoline taxes, some of which provide funds for the maintenance of highways. On the other hand, county and local governments fund some highway construction. A three-way combination of state funds, regional funds, and user fees can potentially fund this portion of the bill. It seems very clear that fares should fund all of the truly variable operating costs. Motorists



pay their own operating costs elsewhere in the state. They don't have these costs when riding the ferry – they have their fair share of the ferry's costs instead. In summary, WSF needs to use the plan to engage its “stockholders” – the public through their elected officials – in a creative dialogue about funding. Poor Cost Control No part of the WSF plan addresses the need, as any business does, to exert reasonable cost control. Cost control normally focuses on labor and fuel costs. WSF is assuming that fuel costs will fall. By the end of the period, they predict these will be \$108 million compared with \$73 million today, despite a larger fleet working more hours and despite inflation. Labor costs are expected to increase from \$138 million at present to \$368 million by 2030. This is an average of 4.2% per year. However, WSF will be operating 25 boats in

8 “Preservation” costs are basically large scale maintenance costs that extend the lives of vessels and terminals. They are treated as capital for accounting reasons. In reality, these costs occur every year – but at different places in the system. 2030 compared with 20 in 2006. When this is taken into account, the average increase is 3.2% a year, which is only a little above inflation of 2.5% a year. While there may be scope to improve labor productivity, the labor bill is only 24% of the total outlays. The most obvious scope for better cost controls relate to capital expenditures. WSF staff have indicated that the new boats they are proposing will cost \$75 million each. To put this number in perspective, the following are the current prices for selected new vessels in the international market, according to the March 2006 survey of Drewry Shipping Consultants Ltd: (1) \$56 mn for a 172,000 DWT Capesize iron ore carrier; (2) \$53 mn for an oceangoing container ship capable of carrying 3500 standard containers; and (3) \$72.5 mn for the largest oil tanker capable of transiting the Suez Canal. Such ships are 50 times the size of a WSF ferry! Equally, incredible capital cost estimates have been developed for several of the terminal costs. These include \$54.7 million for a second slip at Southworth – about the same price as Fortescue Metals will pay for a completely new iron ore terminal capable of handling 40 mn tonnes of cargo per year in Australia. A bill of \$131.2 million is proposed at Mukilteo to add a second loading slip plus a Sounder rail station⁹. A staggering \$178.6 million is proposed for Anacortes to support what appears to be one additional vessel. By contrast, the redevelopment of Colman Dock in Seattle is a modest \$200 million to support a major expansion from 4 to 7 vessels in the context of the complexities of a major project in downtown Seattle. Some of these numbers bear no relation to traffic. The vehicle increase forecast for Anacortes, including Sydney, is 468,000 per year over the next 30 years. To spend \$178.6 million on terminal improvement represents \$381 per vehicle! At 5% interest, this implies a cost increase of \$17 per trip! There are undoubtedly reasons why WSF appears to have very high costs indeed. Ferries are more complex vessels than dry bulk cargo ships. The Jones Act requires that these vessels be built in the U.S. Washington State makes the problem worse by forcing them to be built locally. However, it is the riders of the WSF system and the state's taxpayers who have to foot the bill. WSF has a duty to at least make these extra costs transparent so that elected officials are aware of the income redistribution implications of such decisions. As to the capital cost problem, its scale is such that to just accept the current situation is not a reasonable basis for a 30-year plan. ⁹ The plan says WSF will spend another \$88 million at Clinton to add a third slip. All that is needed here are the wing walls and loading bridge, so this must be a misprint. Surely the real cost is nearer \$8 million.

Summary

WSF does a good job of running a safe, reliable and affordable system. It is of critical



importance to the ferry-dependent communities that this system remains reliable and evolves to meet our changing needs. WSF proposes to deliver on this need by business as usual. But this concept is not sustainable in the long-term. The plan they have prepared does not properly recognize this constraint. Based on the discussion in this report, the following are concrete suggestions to WSF as to ways in which the plan can, and should, be improved: (1) do not try to accommodate “growth” on an open-ended basis but plan to consciously shift a significantly higher proportion of the overall traffic, particularly commuter traffic, to high occupancy vehicles and public transport; (2) base planning around a fair and rational analysis of the cost of delays that is consistent across routes; (3) do not single out the Keystone-Pt Townsend route for a cut in service quality, given that its growth prospects are broadly comparable to other routes; (4) modify the single boat strategy by adding a small number of smaller boats to better serve the lower volume routes in the system; (5) abandon the one-price-fits-all strategy; create a route-specific pricing strategy to give ferry users appropriate signals that encourage fundamentally more efficient use of ferry capacity; (6) engage the stakeholders in a more constructive dialogue about a long-term funding solution based on an economically rational approach that is fair from the perspective of the state as a whole; and (7) recognize that there is a serious cost control issue and develop a credible medium-term strategy to address it.

Comment Date: 4/25/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Anonymous

Organization:

Comment:

I do not believe any suggested plan to use the Keystone Harbor is viable. The “red barn” site to the east would provide a direct approach from Highway 525, sufficient staging area for any potential need and equal crossing time from port Townsend, as well as eliminate ferry traffic from Main Street in Coupeville.

Comment Date: 4/25/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Sarah Howard

Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

1) We need to address pedestrian ticket-taking at the Mukilteo o terminal of the



Mukilteo/Clinton run.

2) Also need to address facilities to accommodate pedestrian customers with luggage/baby strollers/extra kids/elderly patients. Also, this needs to be immediate, filling in the interim until the Mukilteo terminal is complete in 2010.

3) Where to put luggage while on the ferry?

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

Include more attention to pedestrian customers to encourage less vehicle transit.

3. Do you have other comments?

1) Yes! Please help accommodate your “bread and butter” commuter passengers by installing a ticket lane for ticket holdings only!!! I know you have heard it before, it would be refreshing to see this topic actually addressed in print or event at community forums.

2) As for security-why don't the bomb-sniffing dogs go amongst the pedestrians as well as the cars?

Comment Date: 4/25/2006

Contact Type: Letter

Name: Bruce Howard

Organization:

Comment:

(Letter written to the Editor at the South Whidbey Record, submitted as a public comment.)

A few years ago, I wrote a “Viewpoint” piece in your publication that questioned the policies of the ferry system after they became exclusive property of the DOT. That letter had to do with ferry operations in general, however this letter-with a particular reference to a comment in my earlier one-talks more specifically about a very troubling situation at the Mukilteo terminal.

Pertinent to the profoundly stupid passenger ticketing arrangement at Mukilteo, was the question I asked some years ago; by what justification did the DOT increase the administrative personnel load within the ferry system by over 300% during the course of their management stint? According to a long-time ferry worker friend of mine, the administrative load was fewer than 90 people prior to the DOT's hiring binge. When I wrote my letter questioning the increase, that number had climbed to over 300. That was prior to nine-eleven, so I don't see how that could be the reason. Perhaps it took a couple of hundred new people sitting at 200 new computers to “do the math” for a new passenger only run to Bremerton. My point is this: If the DOT can hire some 300 so new people to do what fewer than 100 were doing for years prior to



their take-over, Why can't they find one person to handle passenger ticketing at the passenger ticketing window at Mukilteo during all the hours the ferries are operating?

Imagine this situation: My brother-in-law and his family fly in from Tallahassee, Florida, grab the airport shuttle, and are delivered to the Mukilteo dock in mid-afternoon. After unloading baggage and young kids, they walk to the passenger only ticket window to buy their tickets. They are told that one of them must cross the road (Hwy 525) as the cars are unloading, walk up to one of the auto ticketing booths, wait for cars to clear, then stand at the window to purchase their tickets. Then, they must return to the dock to board the ferry. Sounds easy, right? What if the family member delivered to the dock waiting area at the "wrong time of day" was in her 70's, used a walker to get around, had baggage for a two-week stay, and the weather was rainy with the wind blowing-and she was told that she had to walk up to the auto ticketing area to buy her ticket? Get the picture? Well, now comes the real information. ON April 5, 2006, a sister-in-law coming to Whidbey with her brother to attend my son's memorial had just called to let us know that she and her brother would be on the 2:30 p.m. boat. Just after making the call, he was told that he had to run up the ferry lanes to the ticket booth to buy his ticket before he could board the boat. Four minutes later, we received another call from his sister-hysterical at the time, as she had just watched her brother get slammed into by one of the cars heading away from the ticket booth to make the 2:30 p.m. boat. I had to come across from Clinton a few hours later to pick him up at the Providence Hospital in Everett. That was on April 5th. With serious muscle and soft tissue damage, he is still at his home in Las Vegas on leave from his work as a Health Inspector for the City of Las Vegas. He can't walk without crutches. Does it take a law suit to get the brain dead management of the ferry system to wake up and realize that they needlessly put people in harm's way by making them purchase walk-on tickets at the auto toll-booth? Evidently, yes. I am not normally a litigious person, however, I concur with my brother-in-law's decision to sue the Washington State Ferry System as well as the person in the car that hit him.

So, DOT: 1) Explain why you can hire 200+ new administrative employees after taking over the ferry system. Note: The answer given to me at the WSF main office in Seattle after asking that same question was, "Well,....(head scratching in progress)...We have much better accountability now." I thought that answer was abysmal then and I feel even more so now. 2) Explain why your agency can hire hundreds of people, but can't afford to have a ticket seller at the window near the dock where most limo drop-offs occur? It will likely take a half-dozen law suits before they get the point. The passenger ticketing system sucks at Mukilteo, especially for first-time visitors or elderly passengers or young mothers with a child in her arms and another in a stroller. What ferry worker wants the task of telling a young mother and her kids that they must go back up the hill, buy their tickets, then make their way back down and cross a busy intersection in order to walk on the boat? None of them. It's the WSF leadership in the hands of the DOT that needs their butts kicked. Fiscally irresponsible, and dumb as well. What a sad combination.



Comment Date: 4/4/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Robert Kenny

Organization:

Comment:

I cannot attend the public hearings that you plan to hold regarding the draft ferries plan. Please read my comments into the record.

I am strongly opposed to the planned structural changes outlined in your draft ferries plan:

Clinton: Add a third slip and overhead passenger loading between 2018-2022

Mukilteo: Relocate and improve the terminal by 2009 and add a second slip by 2018

for the following reasons:

1. The overhead passenger loading dock at Clinton will be huge and ugly. The ferry complex has already become huge, and has totally changed the character of the entry to Whidbey Island.
2. The planned Mukilteo transportation center will also add to the urbanization and sprawl of the area, inserting a monstrosity in what is now a fairly charming area, especially with the lighthouse.
3. We don't want more cars on Whidbey. Already it is impossible for cars or pedestrians to cross Highway 525 when the ferries are unloading. During rush-hour unloadings, traffic on 525 decreases from the 55 mph speed limit to 40 mph, with bumper-to-bumper traffic. During daytime and evening hours, it is impossible to pass slow-moving vehicles, due to the onslaught of oncoming traffic.
4. As you know, the highway has been designated a scenic route in recent years. Unfortunately, it is losing its charm and beauty, as more and more traffic clogs it. Expanding the ferry capacity in Mukilteo and Clinton will only make this situation much worse, and will soon require an expansion of the lanes on 525. The attractiveness of Whidbey Island lies mostly in its rural beauty and charm, and the less hectic and congested nature of life. This will be completely destroyed if a four-lane highway gobbles up the middle of the island.
5. Already, due to the increased "consumer" traffic on 525, developers are requesting permissions to build huge building complexes on or along 525, near the ferry and in Freeland, 10 minutes north of the Clinton terminal. When residents learned of this plan a year ago and, again, recently, and that the Commissioners were seeking to change the building code, to accommodate this monstrosity, a huge public outcry arose. The Commissioners then deceitfully and sneakily "re-interpreted" the code and is now trying to ignore the will of their constituents. This pressure will only increase if the Mukilteo and Clinton terminals are expanded.
6. Expanding the ferry terminals and traffic will greatly increase pollution in the Sound.



As far as we're concerned, this is a make-it-or-break-it political issue, at the top of our list. We hope our representatives, particularly Sen. Haugen, will oppose these expansions in the terminals. Let's protect the things that attract so many tourists to the area and fill government coffers with sales taxes. If you expand the terminals, you will help destroy Whidbey's beauty, and a major source of its revenue.

Comment Date: 4/23/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Paul Luczyk

Organization:

Comment:

With a 3rd boat planned along with increased traffic for Mukilteo, what is your plan for getting the the cars off the Mukilteo speedway? Do you have a plan? Have you seen the cars lined up to almost 84th? Have you seen the cars blocking driveways and side streets?

Comment Date: 4/5/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Glenn Smith

Organization:

Comment:

Looks like a well thought out solid plan from my perspective as a Whidbey Island (Clinton-Mukilteo) commuter. Good job.

Comment Date: 4/5/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Julie Glover and Vicki Jacob

Organization:

Comment:

We can't go to the public hearings that you plan to hold regarding the draft ferries plan, so please read our comments into the record:

We are very strongly opposed to the planned structural changes outlined in your draft ferries plan (Clinton: add a third slip and overhead passenger loading between 2018-2022;



Mukilteo: relocate and improve the terminal by 2009 and add a second slip by 2018). As far as we're concerned, this is a make-it-or-break-it political issue, at the top of our list. We hope our representatives, particularly Sen. Haugen, will oppose these expansions in the terminals. Let's protect the things that attract so many tourists to the area and fill government coffers with sales taxes. If you expand the terminals, you will help destroy Whidbey's beauty, and a major source of its revenue. More specifically:

1. Highway 525 has been designated a scenic route in recent years. Unfortunately, it is losing its charm and beauty, as more and more traffic clogs it. Expanding the ferry capacity in Mukilteo and Clinton will only make this situation much worse, and will soon require an expansion of the lanes on 525. The attractiveness of Whidbey Island lies mostly in its rural beauty and charm, and the less hectic and congested nature of life. This will be completely destroyed if a four-lane highway gobbles up the middle of the island. The overhead passenger loading dock at Clinton will be huge and ugly. The ferry complex has already become huge, and has totally changed the character of the entry to Whidbey Island.

2. We don't want more cars on Whidbey. Already it is impossible for cars or pedestrians to cross Highway 525 when the ferries are unloading. During rush-hour unloadings, traffic on 525 decreases from the 55 mph speed limit to 40 mph, with bumper-to-bumper traffic. During daytime and evening hours, it is impossible to pass slow-moving vehicles, due to the onslaught of oncoming traffic.

3. Already, due to the increased "consumer" traffic on 525, developers are requesting permissions to build huge building complexes on or along 525, near the ferry and in Freeland, 10 minutes north of the Clinton terminal. When residents learned of this plan a year ago and, again, recently, and that the Commissioners were seeking to change the building code, to accommodate this monstrosity, a huge public outcry arose. The Commissioners then deceitfully and sneakily "re-interpreted" the code and is now trying to ignore the will of their constituents. This pressure will only increase if the Mukilteo and Clinton terminals are expanded.

4. The planned Mukilteo transportation center will also add to the urbanization and sprawl of the area, inserting a monstrosity in what is now a fairly charming area, especially with the lighthouse.

5. Expanding the ferry terminals and traffic will greatly increase pollution in the Sound.

Comment Date: 4/26/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Marion Huxtable

Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?



- 1) I think frequency of service is more important than volume/size. 45 minute sailings needed.
 - 2) I am concerned about the increase in traffic being discharged at one time and the impact on Sims Way in Port Townsend.
 - 3) I want Upper Sims Way to be a commerce, pedestrian and bicycle friendly part of Port Townsend.
-
2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?
 - 1) On Page 9 I see no plans or policies for passenger only ferries that would reduce impacts on our local roads.
 - 2) The assumption is that the terminal will be in "downtown." Why not at Glenn Cove?
 3. Do you have other comments?
 - 1) Need a protected walkway for pedestrians-otherwise pedestrians will not like it.
 - 2) Consider Evergreen Class vessels as a compromise.
 - 3) I think it is important to change from single compartment vessels.
 - 4) Consider using Park & Ride as a holding area if we must have larger ferries.

Comment Date: 5/7/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Anonymous

Organization:

Comment:

I'd like to see smaller ferries than what is proposed and keep the more frequent runnings. Don't change a thing just run more. Move the terminal to the paper mill. Think radical! It would give us parking overnight, plenty of waiting area and will not congest downtown.



Comment Date: 5/3/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Linda Lou Marshall

Organization:

Comment:

You know, I'll bet that the clothing manufacturers would love to only have to make their products in one size. But the reality is that one size does NOT fit all – when it comes to clothes or providing quality service to Puget Sound communities that are varied in size and docking conditions.

I've written before to suggest that the wonderful old vessels on the PT / Keystone run be replaced with newer SMALL vessels. But I've been told that the WSF system is determined to have all the boats be the same large ones and that I am just wasting my time. Yes, I know that vessels go down and that it's darn handy to be able to substitute any vessel on the route. But here's why that logic (from my point of view) is flawed:

You don't have the Keystone side of the run figured out yet for the big boats, but are ready to tear into the PT side of the project. Tourists will NOT sit at Keystone, where there is nothing to do, for 90 minutes if they miss one of the big boats. It's easy to hang out for 45 minutes in the summer – but 90 minutes is crazy. Major negative impact on major economy in Port Townsend (tourism) in the summer months.

By switching to the big boats you will effectively deliver FEWER people here than you do now. (150 on two small vessels within 90 minutes vs. 130 on one big vessel in 90 minutes.)

You will end up ruining this side of the run from the point of view of sailors (major importance to us!), the historic downtown district (we care about that too!), and the residents who now sit for long periods of time trying to cross/turn left on the one and only route out of town. Traffic congestion is already a major problem here due to us being at the end of the road – one way in and one way out. Over 22,000 cars a day currently pass through the intersections of Hwy 19 & 20.

In winter, you will run mostly empty boats and cost us (all of us, since you'll pass the cost along) more in fuel than a small vessel would.

Not that anything I've said makes a whit of difference – or what anyone else says during the public process. The “public process” smacks of WSF creating the impression of fairness while they listen patiently to the citizens express their desires. But WSF has already made the decision that it planned to make in the first place. Big boats, bigger dock, tremendous traffic congestion - with fewer people transported than we have now at a higher cost. Sounds like government agency logic in action to me!



Comment Date: 5/4/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Robert Frank

Organization:

Comment:

Once again I must object to the plans to expand the Port Townsend terminal at its present site. The increase in peak traffic, the increase in parking lot and street holding capacity, coupled with no net capacity increase and less frequent service make me strongly oppose nearly all aspects of planning! A site located out of the downtown area should be considered. I'd be interested in vehicle destination figures if any are available. Considering the costs involved, routing traffic through the business district when most (by my estimation) heads out of (and through) town is very poor planning!

Comment Date: 4/26/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Mary Davies

Organization:

Comment:

I hope to be at the May meeting in PT. I am very concerned about the idea of such a large ferry, and about reducing the frequency of service. This seems like a bad idea. And I wonder if the decreasing availability of petroleum fuel, and its increasing cost, are being factored into your long-term planning.

Comment Date: 5/7/2006

Contact Type: Letter

Name: Ken Shaver

Organization:

Comment:

Old Fort Townsend State Park for new ferry dock

Points for:

- Only two miles further for ferry.



- Good water depth, 5 fathoms within 200 foot of high ground.
- Would relieve traffic congestion downtown i.e. 150 car parade every hour.
- State already owns property.
- Would give ferry passengers a nice view of Port Townsend. It could help tourism and encourage them to visit. AS it is very few stop by not willing to miss the boat.
- There would be more room for foot passengers at downtown ferry dock.
- Merchants would gain. Traffic Congestion would be eased on Sims Way.
- There is ample cleared land at Old Fort Townsend for parking. Access is in close proximity to highways 19 and 10 both into and out of town.
- Existing campgrounds need not be disturbed by this development.
- Old historic part of town need not be disturbed.

Comment Date: 4/21/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Martin Vetere

Organization:

Comment:

This very same message was sent at 4:20 , 4:31 & 4:33. You must really want participation at your meetings.

But there's no sense in attending your meetings and suggesting that the larger ferries will create more and longer congestion on Hwy 20, the ONLY road in/out of Port Townsend.

The state does not seem to want to relocate the ferry terminal outside of the downtown Port Townsend area. I understand that the relocation would be more expensive than upgrading the existing terminal. But "think big, but cheap" seems to be the state motto in all planning.

Expend the bucks & do it right.



Comment Date: 5/7/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: John Molsness

Organization:

Comment:

Re: Plans to expand dock size and ferry capacity at Port Townsend.

Assuming the dock and ferry capacities will be increased the ferry service needs to do the following to accommodate the greater traffic density heading south on SR 20:

1. Expand and lengthen the two southbound lanes from ferry intersection to the first curve. Use retaining walls if needed.
2. Install two new traffic signals on Sims Way at McPherson and Howard Streets. These were promised in 2001 by DOT as part of that year's overlay on 20. (No roundabouts allowed).
3. Program the route signals for 28 mph when ferry traffic is moving.

Comment Date: 5/3/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Katy Gifford

Organization:

Comment:

I just read in the Port Townsend Leader that the meeting is to be Tuesday, May 9 from 6:30 to 8:30 at the Commons at Fort Warden. Is this correct? I am wondering if I missed an Email from WSF on this, as I thought the date was to be 5-11, time to be determined.

Comment Date: 4/4/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Ryan Wallin

Organization:

Comment:

My name is Ryan Wallin and I commute at least three times a week from Oak Harbor to Bremerton, and 90% of the time, I utilize the Keystone/Pt. Townsend Ferry. In the last two



months, it seems that I have missed the boat due to over crowding, than I have made the boat. I am asking that you implement the dual ferry system earlier in the season, even if it is only on a rush hour and weekend schedule. After a long commute, to add 90 minutes of additional wait time makes for a long and frustrating day.

Comment Date: 5/7/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Anonymous

Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

I dislike going to a larger boat! 1) Huge waste of gas in the off-season 2) Too long a wait for walk-ons in high season, 3) Too much traffic unloading and impacting traffic.

I agree the loading dock should be extended but not rearranged on the land side-we'll lose precious parking spaces and it's harder for large trucks to make a left turn!

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

Yes! Planning assumes a major increase in traffic. With skyrocketing gas prices and a nearly bankrupt federal reserve, just the opposite is possible if not likely.

3. Do you have other comments?

There is absolutely no ferry parking in Port Townsend now! Folks use the bank on weekends but that will be eliminated by current plans! Give us a parking lot for walk-ons!

Comment Date: 5/7/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Marilyn Muller

Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

I think dumping 140 cars into downtown Port Townsend is ludicrous. I can't imagine what kind of studies would support that. Traffic is bad enough without your proposal and has grown tremendously over the last 10 years. That kind of increase will (no doubt) continue.



2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

Move it out of town. Have a bus-shuttle meet each boat for walk-ons. We can revise the Comp Plan. We've done it before on other issues.

3. Do you have other comments?

It was stated that fares would have to be raised again to cover your proposal. Wouldn't it be cheaper to repair-retrofit the boats we now have*, repair not expand the dock, leave Keystone the way it is-add an extra ferry during peak times in the summer-maybe weekends only.

*which are charming old boats

Comment Date: 5/7/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Bryan Hayes

Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

I think we should do what ever is most economical now and spend and plan more for future and longer term plans that will work for the downtown Port Townsend area.

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

Long-term plan to move the ferry terminal out of Port Townsend's downtown area to Glen Cove area (perhaps when the paper mill there eventually goes broke). Planning on this now may prove to be economical as its still undeveloped industrial area.

Comment Date: 5/7/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Anonymous

Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?



I say look internally for cost savings and efficiency. I have heard there are 600 employees involved in administration and 800 crew aboard ferries. This is obviously an extremely top heavy organization. I think state ferries need to have a variety of services and boats in service to meet a variety of situations i.e. state of the art mosquito fleet as well as passenger ferries.

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

In what ways have these issues been factored into the ferry options?

1. Global warming-rising sea level
2. Peak oil-rising fuel costs
3. The need for more frequent ferry crossings
4. Economy of scale must consider the small town life style of Port Townsend.

In what ways is the ferry system implementing conservation on boats, in offices as a way to reduce overall costs? Other than larger boats and less frequent runs. In what ways is the ferry system coordinating with mass transit to help people get out of their cars?

V. San Juan Corridor



Comment Date: 6/27/2006

Contact Type: Letter

Name: Alan Lichter, Chair

Organization: San Juan County Council

Comment:

As you know, San Juan County is completely dependent on Washington State Ferries (WSF) for travel among the major islands of the county as well as to and from the mainland portion of the state. AS a result, WSF planning as it relates to service in this county, as well as its overall financial well-being, is of deep interest and concern to us. With that in mind, we would like to offer the following observations on WSF's draft long-range plan.

First, the economic impacts of the huge increase in island fares-approximately doubling since 2000, with additional impacts on inter-island travel-are clear and painful for individuals and businesses. While the long-range plan calls for fares to rise just 2.5% per year, there are enough financial uncertainties articulated elsewhere in the plan to lead us to fear that the reality will be significantly higher increases. At the same time, the plan calls for no increase in the number of ferries to serve the San Juans until at least 2017, and only small improvements in capacity during other seasons between 2009 and 2017.

Beyond the very significant financial issues unanswered in the draft plan, WSF is putting forward a capital-construction program that is very aggressive even for a system that faces major economic challenges. By far, the largest portion is for the improvement of terminals, including \$120 million for the Anacortes terminal, with lesser amounts for new vessels. The added pressure created for increasing fares, especially given the plan's already out-of-date fuel-cost estimates, is of real concern to us and our constituents.

Given the economic challenges of WSF's long-range plan, and because of this county's complete dependence on ferry service, we believe it is imperative that a full economic-impact study of San Juan County be made a statutory prerequisite to any future fare increases on San Juan Islands routes that exceed 2.5% in any year. While many of the residents of the county may not yet grasp the relationship between potential fare increases and the long-range plan, we do, and we ask that this economic impact requirement be included in the plan.

Further, the long-range plan is silent on the question of funding traffic improvements in the Town of Friday Harbor that are critical today. Without funding, the current intermodal study will be ineffective, as financial support will be critical if recommendations from that study are to be completed. As a result, the dwell time in Friday Harbor will continue to be an efficiency drag on service throughout the county.

The draft plan seems to accept as givens the growing limits to efficient service not just in Friday Harbor, but at the Orcas and Lopez terminals as well, including parking adequacy at the Lopez ferry landing. That makes no operational or financial sense to use, either in the near or long term. Especially since losing the increases in Capron Funds, our ability to make meaningful financial contributions to these necessary improvements is extremely limited. They need to be included in the WSF's plan, and they need to be funded. Could some of those capital dollars be diverted from the planned improvements at the Anacortes terminal? We welcome the



anticipated addition of the third slip at the Anacortes Terminal as it is clear that this will directly improve services to the islands. Overall, we are concerned that the Long-Range Plan does not give sufficient priority to the needs of San Juan County.

Thank you for considering our observations.

Comment Date: 7/21/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Carrie Brooks

Organization: Friday Harbor Town Council

Comment:

As an elected Town Council person for Friday Harbor, I have great concern about the turnaround time of ferries in Friday Harbor to get more ferries and ferry spaces, too. I have waited in line 7 hours to get off the island for a vacation. The only time in 18 years of living here that I have been to Sydney/Victoria, I was bumped, even though I had a reservation, and it took me 24 hours to get there by driving to Anacortes, spending the night in Blaine, and taking the Canadian ferry to Sydney. Last night at the Friday Harbor Town Council meeting, it was mentioned that you would like a 30-minute turnaround time per boat. I have several times seen ferry workers in no hurry to load after the cars have unloaded the ferry, and this was because they were on schedule--no need to hurry.

Also, if you compare the way the ferry attendants let people off and on ferries with the Bremerton run, Friday Harbor attendants and ferry workers are much slower. Our cars slowly move on and off. Bremerton's cars are going 25 miles an hour almost immediately after getting the hand sign from the ferry attendant. Maybe the attendants could be trained to use South Sound techniques. Also, all of our truck traffic tends to be slower loading and unloading. Our biggest problem with speed, however, is the foot traffic. Hundreds of individuals are walking the long extension to Front Street before any cars can leave the ferry. Either we hold the walk-ons upstairs on the ferry until after the cars go, and keeping pedestrians out of the way of cars going up the hill, or we build a movable ramp of some kind for them to exit the ferry outside of the car lanes and at the same time as the cars. We don't have the ability now to double-lane load ferries, I don't believe, but we do have a few ideas about double-lane unloading which will be developed further in the Intermodal Committee with WA State Ferries, Town of Friday Harbor, and the Port of Friday Harbor. Anchor Management has been working with the Town in trying to improve the flow of traffic, also. We are doing all we can now, and will continue to be vigilant in solving this problem.

The most important thing you can do for us is to communicate to us in public meetings here in Friday Harbor, giving plenty of time for the notice to be given to the public. Many people do not know about the meetings. And meeting times that have been agreed to by our mayor would be beneficial so as not to have a major conflict. We lost the planning for funding for a second ferry slip because no one except our former mayor knew about a ferry meeting or what would be discussed a few years ago. One and a half years later, the Town Council was shocked to find out about the meeting and what our former mayor had said, which was contrary to the Council



and to the general public. We do not want that to happen again. Thank you for working on this difficult project.

Comment Date: 7/27/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Lori Stokes

Organization: San Juan Island Anti-Litter Initiative

Comment:

I understand that you are soliciting public comments about the ferry system, as you do planning for the future.

I live in Friday Harbor and am active in the San Juan Island Anti- Litter Initiative, a partnership of about 40 organizations that are concerned about litter on our beautiful island's roadsides and are attempting to do something about it -- both clean-up and prevention.

One of our concerns has to do with what the ferry system is doing to create a part of the problem, and how we can encourage you to consider litter clean-up and prevention in your long-term planning efforts.

Our first problem is with the lack of trash receptacles at the three parking areas in Friday Harbor. Until fairly recently, there were no trash receptacles at all in these lots, so people just dropped lots of "stuff" in or near the lots, creating a major eyesore. With the help of Jayne Davis in Seattle, we were finally given four tin trash cans to use here. Unfortunately, while we appreciate WSF's effort to respond to the problem, these cans just don't do the job. They are small, they are light in weight (the tops blow off easily in the wind), crows and other wildlife can easily get into them, and they are not terribly attractive.

We are currently relying on Mike Aiken's crew to keep emptying them out, and it just doesn't happen on a regular basis...leading to even more of an eyesore. For the last several days, two of the cans have been filled to overflowing, and a fair amount of garbage is just piling up right around them. It's pretty disgusting to look at, and reflects badly on both WSF and the Town of Friday Harbor. I hesitate to even mention the public health issue involved.

Our second problem is with the use of the paper tags that are regularly put on car windshields in Anacortes, both for counting purposes and for overload. Once cars arrive here on the Island, these tags blow out from under windshield wipers and become roadside litter. Whenever you walk around this island, you see many, many WSF tags alongside the roads.

Several of us have been trying to get somebody at WSF to do something to fix this. We've suggested not using tags at all, but instead using dry-erase markers on the windshields. The ferry people here in Friday Harbor are doing this now, and it seems to be working quite well. Our other suggestion is to have ferry workers remove the tags from car windshields while the ferries are en route. Yesterday, a friend of mine tried this herself on the late afternoon ferry from Anacortes to Friday Harbor, and it took her all of 20 minutes to sweep through the boat and



get all the tags off the windshields. Her effort prevented almost 100 tags from becoming roadside litter here.

I know that WSF wishes to operate in an environmentally sound way, and it certainly feels to me that dealing with this (relatively small) set of problems should be an important priority, and not a high cost item.

Comment Date: 5/17/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: William Myers

Organization:

Comment:

Do not like cancellation of Anacortes - Sidney B.C. in the winter.

Do not like the 7:45 AM departure of Anacortes-- Sidney BC ferry, in winter when operating. During this period we drive to Tsqwwassen and take the BC Ferry to Victoria.

Too bad you cannot provide better service to your Anacortes customers!

Comment Date: 5/4/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: D. Magley

Organization:

Comment:

More afternoon service to San Juan Island.



Comment Date: 7/1/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Chris & Don Prochnow

Organization:

Comment:

Please accept the following suggestion for discussion regarding your long range planning:

We know that you are in need of increased revenues to support the system and having been in business ourselves we can empathize with your situation.

Although we are communicating on behalf of our particular route, we are sure that other routes would take advantage of the following suggestions:

Please be advised that there are more than a handful of San Juan County residents who would be willing to pay a "reservation surcharge" if that option was afforded to us. We are certain that many tourists would also support this idea.

This "reservation surcharge" could be of benefit in a variety of ways.

1. Residents would have a guaranteed space to return home on a specific sailing allowing us to make more efficient use of our time on the mainland.
2. Tourists would be able to better plan their visits which would be beneficial to the tourist industry.
3. WFS would generate additional revenue which could be used to offset expected fuel increases, possibly delaying the next round of overall tariff increases.

The "reservation surcharge" could be a non-refundable fee similar to the system employed for the International sailings. A percentage of the spaces could be held as reserved: say 30-40% of the space allocation. If an individual with a reservation does not arrive at the toll booth by a specified time, say 20 minutes prior to sailing, that reserved space could be freed up to be filled by another waiting vehicle and the "no show" would forfeit their deposit.

Contrary to what you may have been led to believe, there are numerous "middle class" islanders who would support this proposal.

We would respectfully suggest that you explore adding this option sooner than later.

Please note that this email has been previously submitted (in part) to the tariff advisory board during 2005.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this suggestion.



Comment Date: 5/1/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Mark Kaiman

Organization:

Comment:

The state ferry system sucks and it will continue to suck until the WSF gets serious about doing something to please its customers instead of its employees and their unions. Look at the BC Ferries: they have restaurants and amenities. Their passenger lounges make ours look like cattle cars. They accept reservations on busy routes. It sounds to me the the WSF is just offering more of the same in its "plan". The boats are old, broken down tubs that get more unreliable every year. Its time to upgrade and innovate. How about adding some value to the San Juan routes like wireless internet and a reservation system for islanders? Either that or scrap the whole system and start building bridges to connect the San Juans to the mainland.

Comment Date: 5/4/2006

Contact Type: Form

Name: Anonymous

Organization:

Comment:

1. What do you think about the proposed service changes in your area?

Need an incentive for people to drive shorter cars so that more cars will fit on existing boats-pay by the foot?

-Different fare class? (e.g. 15 ft vs 20 ft)

This will address the problem of insufficient capacity to Friday Harbor. The Sealth is too small for this run.

2. Do you have comments about key planning assumptions, policy implications, or the funding framework (please see page 9 of your handout)?

The ridership to Friday Harbor has been decreasing recently due to steep fare increases. This trend may continue, thereby reducing future income vs. the Plan.



Comment Date: 4/28/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Dan Zaehring

Organization:

Comment:

I have three (3) comments which I will not be able to deliver in person at the public meetings as I will be out of state. They are:

1. It would be good if your comment sheet on your website allowed online input rather than having to print it out, fill it out and mail it in.
2. San Juan Islands (and Vashon) need to be treated philosophically different than other locations since there is absolutely no alternative to the ferry for a vehicle. Yes, other locations would view the highway alternative as very inconvenient but not as bad as 3-4 hour waits in a ferry line. Fare equity needs a tilt to make this factor more even.
3. Island residents have a high degree of need to be able to get off in the morning, do all errands, doctor visits, business, etc., and get back the same evening. Shortening the time available to get these done on the "mainland" increases the need for frequency (and expense). Wait times for an island resident are usually counted in the total round trip time (Currently about 12 hours away time for 6 productive hours on the mainland). The question becomes "how soon do I have to be in the line with my cooler of Costco frozen food to be assured of getting home on that ferry." Hopefully my comments will find their way to the proper place for input.

Comment Date: 7/14/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Sally Stern

Organization:

Comment:

These comments have also been submitted to the Anacortes Remodel comment line.

I believe long-range plans need to incorporate support of walk-on passengers, on either end of Anacortes/Island routes. Free or inexpensive parking must be available in sufficient numbers at all terminals. Currently it can cost more to park a car in Anacortes and walk on the ferry, than to pay for tickets and wait in line for hours.

Obviously it is not the ferry systems responsibility to get walk on passengers to their intended destinations once they leave the ferry - but it seems planners should incorporate working with transportation providers at the ends of all routes to encourage and support ferry users who attempt to limit their dependence on private automobiles.



Encouraging walk-on passengers has the potential to be quite cost effective, as lowering the number of cars using the ferries could lower the number of ferries needed. Not considering the enthusiastic support of walk-on ferry passengers on the San Juan runs is extremely short-sighted. Please make this a serious part of your long-range planning.

Comment Date: 5/4/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Ed and Betty Carlberg
Organization:

Comment:

We are "Ferry Lovers of Washington (Go With the Flow!)", having lived on the island for the past 27 years, with no other means of traveling off-island, as we say here, and are dependent on our ferries.

We would like to respectfully suggest that the following idea be considered:

Limit service to Sidney to once a day only. Travelers wishing to go that way have several choices - the ferry from Port Angeles, the B.C. ferries from Vancouver, the Victoria Express boats from Seattle, and a passenger boat from Roche Harbor in the summer.

We, however, have no other choice unless an emergency justifies flying.

If a Sidney bound ferry stopped at both Orcas and Friday Harbor on the way to and from B.C. this could conceivably free up another trip to serve our islands. A requirement for reservations for the Sidney ferry would be needed, as it is now in the summer.

Comment Date: 7/31/2006
Contact Type: Email

Name: Jack Manon
Organization:

Comment:

I am a regular ferry user and resident of San Juan Island. I have reviewed the long range plan in depth.

A major problem that is not addressed at Anacortes is the traffic bottleneck where all ferry loading and unloading narrows to two lanes. Nothing in the proposed plan expands this. There is still a limit of either loading or unloading only one ferry at a time.

I suggest you expand the load/unload pavement width to 4 lanes minimum. As a suggestion,



utilizing the space between the water and the lane currently marked #1 as an exit lane in addition to the current exit lanes would allow simultaneous loading/unloading of two ferries. I understand the current roadway (Hwy 20 spur) cannot handle the traffic of two ferries being unloaded simultaneously at this time. However, if we don't plan ahead with a greater vehicle transfer capability at the terminal, we are going to spend another 25 years with that two lane bottleneck loading or unloading one ferry at a time. I cannot imagine the proposed traffic of six ferries being transferred through that two lane ramp.

I would far prefer to see WSDOT funds spent to expedite loading and unloading of ferries rather than spend the funds to house travelers while they wait in the queue for one ferry to load / unload at a time.

The Anacortes terminal should be a transfer point, not a destination.

Comment Date: 7/30/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Gene Wilkinson

Organization:

Comment:

The ferry is very important to the San Juan Islands. However we do not understand King Co. ferry fares going up 5% and ours 25+% so you can say fares only went up 9%. We think it has to do with population and the islands vote has no impact or political threat to WSF administrators. The ferry administration has repeatedly said the islands will not receive more ferries /day because all the islands have to load and offload a single lane of cars and take too much time.

Second, none have overhead walkways which mean walk-ons and offs also hold up the process. Still you want to build a mega terminal at Anacortes that already has multiple docks, 2 lanes for cars and overhead walkway. If you cannot provide more ferries /day why do we need a costly mega terminal?

Third, we have longer routes and cannot drive around via Hood Canal etc. but we get smaller and older ferries. The best way to help is to provide newer ferries with more capacity that are more reliable.

Fourth, at Friday Harbor you built new restrooms and a small storage room. The building is approx. 10"x 30" and a person doing cement work said the contract for it was \$725,000 or \$2,400 / sq. ft. Typical government waste. We hate to think of the millions it would require to make Anacortes in to a mega terminal. WSF must have excess funds that must be spent. Then you would have another excuse to raise our fares. Ferry rider ship is stagnant due to escalating fares. Actually the affluent are flying. The cost differential has narrowed significantly and they eliminate the waiting. Air service rider ship has had a 30-40% increase in the last few years. We've heard of some who park and fly to the islands and ride the ferry back (free direction)



when they return to the mainland. We have found that it is cheaper to stay over on the mainland in a motel than to return home and go back to finish our needs, medical, business or what ever. We also pick up items for others to save them the cost. Thus ferry fares are about maxed out. The ferry for us is an extension of HWY 20 --- We would like to see tolls on the highways over the Cascades particularly in winter to defray extra costs as they get the free part of DOT and we all pay the same gas tax.

Comment Date: 7/31/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Tom Schultz

Organization:

Comment:

After living on San Juan Island for 13 years and traveling frequently on Anacortes-San Islands routes for my job, I would like to offer these suggestions for your long range ferry transportation plan:

1) More boats are not needed in summer (winter OK) with the exception of a single daily sailing that is primarily for commercial trucks which are becoming a significant part of each sailing and slow loading efforts for cars. B.C. Ferries do this now with improved efficiency.

2) Use only super-class or larger boats on the Anacortes runs. We have a limited amount of runs over a very long distance. Use 160 car or greater capacities to reduce the daily overloads we have each summer and afternoons westbound in other seasons.

3) Eliminate the Sydney B.C runs or use the full capacity of these large boats to serve the domestic routes. I watch these Sydney sailings leave Anacortes usually <50% full without taking any of overloaded boats from Anacortes to Friday Harbor where they stop to onload a few cars, but not offload (compare the loads on the 2:00 PM westbound sailings in the afternoon to Sydney (mostly empty) & the 3:10 & 5:10 sailings to Friday Harbor which are usually overloaded each summer. This backs up cars requiring them to wait until 8:30 PM to get to Friday Harbor. Filling up the Sydney run would only take 10 minutes more to offload and make the sailing more coat efficient with a fuller boat.

4) Implement a reservation system for at least westbound domestic vehicle travel. Every private transportation company I know -does this. I always have to leave meeting early to come hours before each sailing to "wait" in the parking lot to ensure I can get on the next sailing. If money is the reason it's not implemented, I'm very willing to pay a small surcharge to insure that I will be on a specific sailing. Provide a given % of each boat for reservations (e.g. 65%) and the rest for first come. We use a VISA or an account and forfeit if we don't show or contact you within so many hours ahead of the sailing.

5) Pedestrian off-loading at Friday Harbor is a bottleneck. The town of FH is holding the rest of us (most of the island) hostage. DO what you can to persuade them to put in an overhead walkway. Thanks for listening to us!



Comment Date: 5/19/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: John Whetten

Organization:

Comment:

I attended the meeting on Lopez Island yesterday afternoon. I want to thank you very, very much for holding the meeting. I thought it was useful and informative, and I was pleased with most of what I heard.

I think your draft long-range plan is a good one. I would put the Friday Harbor mess at the top of the list of things to fix, and I agree the Anacortes terminal needs replacement.

I am not so sure about the need for 6 vessels. The need for extra boats comes largely by having to haul vehicles back and forth.

Passenger decks are seldom--if ever--full. I know that you are projecting a greater increase in riders than vehicles, yet I didn't hear the basis for that projection. If we can improve the ratio a little bit, why can't we improve it a lot? Maybe inland parking lots with shuttles to the terminals (and public transport on the Anacortes side) would work. It seems to me that you could subsidize quite a bit of public transportation (broadly defined) for the cost of building, operating, and maintaining a ferry.

Finally, I agree with Bob Myhr--the WSF system generally works extremely well, and I thank you all for that. I wanted to add that I think the Lopez Island staff do an exceptionally good job. They are unfailingly cheerful, informed, and efficient. I am very grateful for them all! I attended the meeting on Lopez Island yesterday afternoon.

Comment Date: 4/6/2006

Contact Type: Phone

Name: William McDowell

Organization:

Comment:

If we use an option that requires a mid-sized Issaquah class vessel, and then another mid-sized Issaquah vessel breaks down somewhere else within the ferry system, is there a "pecking order" of what vessels/routes the replacement would come from? (Is there an order of who's boat would be used 1st as a replacement)

He is worried that if they use vessels that can be used throughout the system, their boats might



be the ones that have to be used as the replacements b/c they are a smaller route.

Comment Date: 4/30/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Anita Orne

Organization:

Comment:

Thanks for the email announcing the public meetings. Unfortunately, being a working person on Orcas, I am unable to attend either...the middle of the day in Anacortes nor the "after the last ferry home" in Friday Harbor.

I do commute by ferry to Shaw one day a week, and I would be truly sorry to lose the Illahee/Evergreen State on that run. It is never overcrowded, those Orcas-Shaw-Lopez runs seem pretty sparse in fact. So let FH have those bigger boats if they need them (which in general I question as well, never having been bumped from one of them either) and leave us our classy round-portholed classics! The attitude on these small interisland boats is priceless to me, and is their beauty as well. I would hate to see them go, do the numbers TRULY warrant that? Thanks for the chance for comment.

Comment Date: 4/5/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Orion Gudgeon

Organization:

Comment:

I know when you raise rates, percentage wise, it usually works across the board, but you are putting the San Juans out of reach in some respects. I just wish you'd be respectful of raising the rates to get there.



Comment Date: 4/28/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Don Webster

Organization:

Comment:

As a resident of Orcas Island, I object to the fact that the San Juan meeting is in Friday harbor AFTER the last inter-island ferry run of the day so we cannot attend. Just another example of governmental agencies saying they want our participation and input but then making it difficult to participate.

My sense is that the meeting schedule is for your convenience rather than those of us dependent on the system.

Shame on you Washington State Ferries. Much as the Anacortes terminal changes were presented as a finished product, this long range planning is also a done deal. Why should I pay to go to Anacortes (or at least to come back from there) to attend the meeting.

Comment Date: 4/28/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Tom Welch

Organization:

Comment:

While I join my fellow islanders throughout the San Juans, and most particularly those that are ferry-served, in applauding your scheduled meeting at Friday Harbor as an excellent means of gathering public input regarding the proposed changes in service....you've scheduled your meeting at a time that will prevent most county residents, particularly those on Orcas, Shaw and Lopez Islands, from attending the meeting! The scheduled time will not permit return to our home islands via ferry that evening, rendering attendance impractical for most.

Thanks for the effort, but I won't be attending the meeting.



Comment Date: 4/19/2006

Contact Type: Email

Name: Bill Devlin

Organization:

Comment:

I have always wondered why you don't seem interested in maximizing the use of the ferries in the winter season. You have all the expenses regardless of how many people use any particular ferry. The BC ferry system offer their seniors free ferry service Monday to Thursday all year long and while I would not expect our system to be that generous, it would seem that they are able to do it without any great negative impact. Maybe a similar plan for Washington seniors with drastically reduced rates at least during the off season might be worth a try. It also might possibly be worth considering for the summer season when the mid week traffic is not nearly as heavy as on weekends. This could have a considerable positive effect upon the catering services who obviously depend on volume. I realize that we have reduced fares for seniors but it does not apply to their vehicles. The round-trip Anacortes to Sidney is now \$64 to \$89 for one senior with car which is a lot of money for people on fixed incomes. This is the part of the fare that has discouraged me from travel on the ferries in the winter or off season.

In Europe they have airline fares for as little as \$2 on certain flights. The rates fluctuate according to demand and increase as the flight date arrives. Like the ferry system they are in the transportation business. The whole purpose of course is to maximize their volume of customers even at ridiculous rates. It is a business plan that is radical to our way of thinking but is paying off for them. Maybe a little thinking "outside the box" might prove beneficial for our venerable Washington Ferry System.